SEMINARY OF THE EAST LIBRARY
3 0513 40041 1886

Harold McClure

2.25

Maroon Buc

March 1

sle nut off.

Denver Seminary Washington DC Extension
c/o First Baptist Church of Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414

Troy Conference Academy

THEOLOGY

OF

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY

DR. GUSTAV FRIEDRICH OEHLER,

LATE PROFESSOR ORDINARIUS OF THEOLOGY, AND EPHORUS OF THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN TÜBINGEN.

A REVISION OF THE TRANSLATION IN CLARK'S FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, WITH THE ADDITIONS OF THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION, AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES,

BY

GEORGE E. DAY,

PROFESSOR OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE AND BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN YALE COLLEGE.

NEW YORK:

FUNK & WAGNALLS, PUBLISHERS,

10 AND 12 DEY STREET.

1883.

028
1883

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1883,
By FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

INTRODUCTION

BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

The singular helpfulness of Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament* to ministers of the Gospel and other biblical students, who have made themselves acquainted with its contents, either in the original or through the Edinburgh translation, is due to its subject, the wide range of thought which it opens, the thoroughness with which the several topics are examined and discussed, and the positive and in general satisfactory results to which the author arrives.

Of the subject—the supernatural character and gradual progress of revelation as exhibited in the Old Testament—a subject now so prominent in the face of the sceptical denials of our times, little need be said beyond what is contained in the suggestive and stimulating introduction of the author. No one can read the clear and firm statements in § 7 without being stirred by the wide sweep of thought proposed to be presented. Embracing as it does the whole field of Israelitish history in its connection with the founding of a kingdom of God among men, the kindred subject of the theocratic ordinances and sacred antiquities of the Jews as giving the limited and temporary form in which that kingdom for ages appeared, and finally the form, extent, and limits of the doctrinal truths presented in the Old Testament, it aims to weave the whole into an organic unity of which the final expression is Christ. The thoroughness with which this has been done, and the repeated revisions to which the author subjected his work during the thirty years in which he lectured upon the theology of the Old Testament, are evident not only in the present volume, but in the forty articles contributed by him to Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, in which several of the most important subjects in this department of study are more fully discussed.*

The foundation of the whole superstructure was laid by the author in a severe

* Of these may be mentioned particularly: Feste der alten Hebräer, Herz im biblischen Sinn, Hoherpriester, Jehova, Kanon des Alten Testaments, Könige in Israel, Leviten, Messias, Opfercultus des A. T., Priesterthum im A. T., Prophetenthum des A. T., Sabbath, Sabbath- und Jubeljahr, Stämme Israels, Tag bei den Hebräern, Testament (Altes u. Neues), Volk Gottes, Weissagung, Elohim, Heiligkeit Gottes, Unsterblichkeit (Lehre des A. T.), Versöhnungstag. These in a very compressed form will be found translated in Dr. Schaff's *Religious Encyclopædia*, 3 vols. imp. 8vo, 1882-1883.

process of critical and exegetical study of the Hebrew Scriptures, the fruits of which appear at every step. It was once said of him that he seemed to be predestined to be an expositor of the Old Testament. His decisions upon the meaning of its most important and difficult passages will bear a comparison, there is no reason to doubt, with the Revised Version of that part of the Bible soon to be issued, as they certainly do with the best results of German biblical learning. So numerous are these passages, which are either critically explained or brought into luminous connection with the subjects to which they relate, that, taken along with the explanations given of their meaning, they supply to a large degree the place of a critical commentary.

The *history* of the Israelitish people, as recorded in the Old Testament, needs now, more than ever, to be made familiar, not only as exhibiting the divine guidance of a chosen race, with the constant revelation of the character and will of God which it involves, and also as containing the *setting* in which prophecy is put, and exhibiting the relations in which it was uttered, but as furnishing the means of judging of the validity of many objections which have been recently urged. The best refutation of not a few of the strange and distorted representations of sacred history now persistently made, is the history itself, and in presenting this in clear outline, to be filled up by the careful study of the biblical narratives, an important help is furnished for gaining a true idea of divine revelation.

The same remark may be made of the sacrificial system and sacred ordinances of the people of Israel, with the additional consideration that the attempt of the recent criticism to represent the biblical account of them as self-contradictory, and to a large extent of comparatively late origin, renders necessary a more particular study of these institutions and laws than has ordinarily been given to them. Altar, tabernacle, sacrifice, feasts, priests, and Levites have now again become subjects of critical inquiry and investigation which cannot safely be neglected. The principal difficulties urged by the scepticism of De Wette and the reconstruction of biblical history proposed by the Hegelian speculations of Vatke, will be found discussed and placed in their true light by Dr. Oehler.* In their more recent form, as presented by the Wellhausen school, and repeated by Prof. Robertson Smith, they are stated and often sharply refuted in the additional notes in the second German edition, a translation of which is given in the present volume. If these notes do not cover the whole ground, which in the nature of the case they cannot undertake to do in a Biblical Theology, they indicate some of the chief points in the present critical controversy, and will certainly be of service in

* An approximation to the proper pronunciation of this name will be made, by those not familiar with German, by giving to the first syllable of Oehler the sound of *ey* in "they."

the reading of the new literature which is sure to appear, devoted exclusively to these discussions.

The crowning part of this wide range of subjects is the clear exhibition of the revelation of Himself, made by the Most High, and the Divine thoughts by which men were educated for the coming of Christ and the truths which He came to teach. In the careful tracing of these thoughts, as revealed in facts and by words in the Old Testament, the author, avoiding both the mystical tendency of Von Meyer and Stier and the mistake of Hengstenberg and others, in endeavoring to put more of completed Christian doctrine into the Old Testament than can be done without violence, has presented the theology of the older part of the Bible in a form which at one and the same time meets the demands of theological science and the practical wants of the Christian believer, and has produced a work which stands, as Dr. Schaff has rightly said (*Religious Encyclopædia*, ii., p. 1685), at the head of this department of biblical study. It was, therefore, only a deserved tribute to its merit that in the *Examinatorium*,* or series of examination questions on the best manuals in the different branches of theology, which has been recently prepared and published for the use of students in the German universities, the *Old Testament Theology* of Oehler was selected to accompany the treatises of Neander, Hagenbach, Winer, Bleek, and others in their own special departments. It should also be mentioned that the publication of the original in Germany in 1873–4 was immediately followed by a translation into English by E. D. Smith and S. Taylor in 1874–5, into French by De Rougemont in 1876, and into Dutch by Dr. Hartog, of Utrecht, in 1879.

With these facts in view, and in the hope of rendering this work, which has been used for two or three years in his class-room with uniformly gratifying results, more accessible and helpful to biblical students, the American editor accepted the invitation of the publishers to undertake a general revision of the English translation in Clark's Foreign Theological Library with the addition of notes on points of special difficulty or importance. Some progress in this direction had been made, when the appearance of a new edition of the original in Germany, by Dr. Theodore Oehler, a younger son of the author, dictated the propriety of bringing this edition into substantial conformity with it. In this process the Edinburgh translation of the text or body of the work, containing the lectures of Dr. Oehler as originally delivered (which has not been materially changed in the recent German edition, although some additions have been made), and of such parts of the notes as have been retained, has been subjected to a thorough revision, requiring numerous changes, in which errors incidental to a

* *Examinatorium über die theologischen Disciplinen nach den gangbarsten Lehrbüchern.* Leipz., 1871–1880.

first translation have been corrected and passages obscurely rendered have been made more intelligible. In these changes, in which it has been sometimes necessary to resort to paraphrase, or at least to abandon a strictly verbal rendering, the excellent Dutch translation of Dr. Hartog has been of appreciable service. The large amount of new matter in the recent German edition (generally indicated by brackets) referring to current discussions on questions of biblical criticism, philology, exegesis, and the history of religions, with references to the most recent literature, rendered necessary in that edition the omission of a number of notes of subordinate importance, which accordingly are for the most part omitted also in this translation. For the same reason it became necessary for the American editor, in the additional notes which seemed to be called for, to restrict himself to the utmost brevity, and even in some cases not to indicate points on which it appears to him the positions or conclusions of the author are not sufficiently guarded or are not supported by evidence.

The other additions and changes made in order to give an increased value to this edition are (1) the greatly enlarged and complete index of texts, (2) the references to the pages of the English translations of German works rather than to the original, and (3) the restoration of italics in the words and sentences designed to be made prominent in the original (also in a few other places), which were neglected to a great extent in the Edinburgh edition. The Hebrew words in the text and notes, while likely to be welcomed by the increasing number of those engaged in the work of the ministry who feel the importance of studying the Old Testament in the original, will occasion no special difficulty to the English reader, as the translation immediately follows, or the meaning can be easily gathered from the connection.

The verification of the numerous references to the Bible has been entirely committed to the Rev. J. A. Spencer, D.D., of New York, who has also revised and corrected the full index of texts, which was originally prepared and thrown into a printed form by the class of 1882 in the Yale Divinity School for their own use, and has adapted the enlarged index of subjects to the paging of the present edition. My thanks are also due to Mr. Arthur D. Bissell, of the Graduate Class in this Seminary, for aid in making the pages referred to in German books correspond to the English or American translations where such exist.

G. E. D.

Divinity School of Yale College,
New Haven, Conn., Nov. 27, 1883.

TITLES OF RECENT WORKS MOST FREQUENTLY CITED OR REFERRED TO IN THIS EDITION.

Baudissin, W. W. "Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte." Heft II. Leipz., 1876–79.

Böhl, E. "Christologie des Alten Testamentes, oder Auslegung der wichtigsten Messianischen Weissagungen." Wien, 1882.

Bredenkamp, C. J. "Gesetz und Propheten. Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentl. Kritik." Erlangen, 1881.

Dillmann, A. "Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus." Leipz., 1880.

Duhm, B, "Die Theologie der Propheten." Bonn, 1875.

Ewald, H. "Lehre der Bibel von Gott oder Theologie des Alten und Neuen Bundes." 4 Bde. Leipz., 1871–1876.

Green, W. H. "Moses and the Prophets." N. Y., 1883.

Herzog. "Real-Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche." Leipz. 22 vols. 1854–1866. 2d ed., 10 vols. (not yet completed), 1877–1882. Abridged and translated with additions under the supervision of Dr. Schaff. New York. 3 vols., imp. 8vo. 1882. (The 3d vol. soon to appear.)

Hitzig, F. "Vorlesungen über biblische Theologie und Messianische Weissagungen." Karlsruhe, 1880.

König, F. E. "Der Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testamentes." 2 Bde. Leipz., 1882.

Köhler, A. "Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testamentes." 2 Bde. Erlangen, 1877–1882.

Kuenen, A. "De profeten en de profetie in der Israel." Leiden, 1875.—"The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel," translated from the Dutch. London, 1877.

Orelli von, C. "Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches." Wien, 1882.

Reuss, E. "Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments." 2 Hälfte. Braunschweig, 1881–82.

Riehm, E. "Die Messianische Weissagung." Gotha, 1875.—"Messianic Prophecy." Edinb., 1875.

—— "Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums." Leipz., 1875–83. (Completed as far as 16. Lief., pp. 1–1536.

Schrader, E. "Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament." 2. Aufl. Giessen, 1883.

Schultz, F. W. "Alttestamentliche Theologie." 2. Aufl. Frankf. a. M., 1878.

Smith, R. Payne. "Prophecy a Preparation for Christ." (Bampton Lecture.) 2d ed. Lond. and N. Y., 1871.

SMITH, W. ROBERTSON. "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church." Lond. and N. Y., 1881.

—— "The Prophets of Israel." Lond. and N. Y., 1882.

WELLHAUSEN, J. Band I. "Ausgabe der Geschichte Israels." 2d edition, under the title "Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israel." Berlin, 1883.

ZÖCKLER. "Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften." 4 Halbbände. 1882–83. (Not completed. To be translated for Clark's Foreign Theol. Library.)

To these may be added:

BRIGGS, C. A. "Biblical Study, its Principles, Methods, and History, together with a Catalogue of Books of Reference." N. Y., 1883.

BÖHL, E. "Zum Gesetz und zum Zeugniss. Eine Abwehr wider die kritische Schriftforschung im Alten Testament," 1883. The latter two have appeared as the last sheets of this work were passing through the press.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION, by the American Editor iii

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE, by the Author 1

PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS.

§ 1. Summary 5

I. Definition and Limits of Old Testament Theology.

§ 2. Definition of Old Testament theology. It embraces the whole field of revelation in the Old Testament 5
§ 3. Relation of Old Testament theology to other Old Testament branches.
§ 4. Sources of Old Testament theology 10

II. Fuller Statement of the Scientific Standpoint of Old Testament Theology.

§ 5. The view of the Old Testament religion proper to Christian theology. 13
§ 6. The Biblical idea of revelation. General and special revelation 14
§ 7. Historical character and gradual progress of revelation. Its relation to the whole of man's life. Its supernatural character 17
§ 8. The Old and the New Testaments in their relation to heathenism and to each other 18

III. History of the Cultivation of Old Testament Theology in the Christian Church.

§ 9. Theological view of the Old Testament in the Early Church and in the Middle Ages 22
§ 10. Theological view of the Old Testament in the age of the Reformation 24
§ 11. Theological conception of the Old Testament in the older Protestant theology 27
§ 12. Conception and treatment of the Old Testament from the end of the 17th to the end of the 18th century 30
§ 13. Rise of a Biblical theology distinct from a dogmatic treatment of the Old Testament by Rationalism, and by the newer history and philosophy of religion 32
§ 14*a*. Theological view of the Old Testament in the earlier Supernaturalism, and in the most recent literature 36
§ 14*b*. Continuation: The most recent literature 39

IV. Method of Biblical Theology. Division of Old Testament Theology.

PAGE

§ 15. Characteristics of the historico-genetic method 41
§ 16. Division of Old Testament Theology stated and defended..... 43

PART I. MOSAISM.

First Section. THE HISTORY OF REVELATION FROM THE CREATION, TO THE SETTLEMENT OF THE COVENANT PEOPLE IN THE HOLY LAND.

§ 17. Division of this history..... 49

I. The Primeval Age.

§ 18. The account of the creation..... 50
§ 19. The origin of evil..... 52
§ 20. The first offering. Cainites and Sethites. Tradition of the Flood. 54

II. The Second Age of the World.

§ 21. Covenant with the world. Noah's saying. Division of mankind... 56
§ 22. The foundation of a people of God..... 58

III. The Time of the Patriarchs.

§ 23. Abraham..... 60
§ 24. Isaac and Jacob..... 64
§ 25. The twelve patriarchs..... 65

IV. The Time of Moses and Joshua.

1. *The deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage.*

§ 26. Condition of the people of Israel in Egypt..... 68
§ 27. The deliverance from Egypt..... 70

2. *The institution of the covenant of the law and the march through the wilderness.*

§ 28. Educational aim of the march through the wilderness. The Covenant of the Law established..... 72
§ 29. The first breach of the covenant. Order of the camp. Departure from Sinai. Sentence on the people..... 74
§ 30. The wandering during thirty-seven years in the wilderness, and events up to the occupation of the land on the east side of the Jordan. 76
§ 31. Deuteronomy. Death of Moses. His position among the organs of revelation..... 78

3. *The settlement of Israel in the Holy Land.*

§ 32. Occupation of Canaan. Extermination of the Canaanites..... 81
§ 33. Division of the land. Character of the Promised Land. Israel at the close of this period..... 83

Second Section. THE DOCTRINES AND ORDINANCES OF MOSAISM.

§ 34. Survey..... 88

First Division. The Doctrine of God and His Relation to the World.

FIRST CHAPTER. *The Mosaic Idea of God.*

PAGE

§ 35. Survey ... 88

I. THE MOST GENERAL NAMES OF THE DIVINE BEING, EL, ELOAH, ELOHIM, EL-ELYON.

§ 36 ... 87

II. EL-SHADDAI.

§ 37 ... 90

III. THE NAME JEHOVAH.

§ 38. Pronunciation and grammatical explanation of the name ... 92
§ 39. Signification of the name ... 95
§ 40. Age and origin of the name Jehovah ... 96
§ 41. Comparison of the name Jehovah with Elohim and El ... 98
§ 42. Attributes or names of God which are derived immediately from the idea of Jehovah ... 100
§ 43. The unity of God ... 102

IV. GOD AS THE HOLY ONE.

§ 44. Formal definition of the idea ... 105
§ 45. Fuller definition of the idea ... 109
§ 46. Characteristics connected with the Divine holiness: Impossibility of picturing God, Omnipresence, Spirituality ... 111
§ 47. The Divine righteousness, faithfulness, and truth ... 112
§ 48. The jealous God ... 113

SECOND CHAPTER. *The Relation of God to the World.*

§ 49. General survey ... 116

First Doctrine. On the Creation and Preservation of the World.

I. ON THE CREATION.

§ 50. Creation by the Word ... 116
§ 51. The Divine Spirit in the Creation ... 118

II. ON THE PRESERVATION OF THE WORLD.

§ 52 ... 119

Second Doctrine. The Divine Aim of the World. Divine Providence.

§ 53. The design of Creation, and its realization through Providence ... 121
§ 54. Relation of the Divine causality to moral and physical evil ... 122

Third Doctrine. Of Revelation.

§ 55. Introductory remark and general view ... 124

I. THE REVELATION OF THE DIVINE BEING.

§ 56. The Divine name ... 124
§ 57. The Divine countenance, and the Divine glory ... 127

II. THE FORMS OF REVELATION.

§ 58. The Divine voice ... 128

PAGE

§ 59. The doctrine of the Angel of the Lord, of the Countenance, of the Covenant. The exegetical state of the case 129
§ 60. Continuation. The different views 131
§ 61. Other points of the Mosaic Angelology 134
§ 62. The Shethina 137
§ 63. The doctrine of miracle. Its appearance in history and various names 138
§ 64. Continuation. More exact definition of miracle 139
§ 65. On the Spirit of God 141
§ 66. The psychical states of the organs of revelation 142

Second Division. The Doctrine of Man.

§ 67. General view 145

First Chapter. *The nature of man in its main unchangeable features.*

I. The Idea of Man.

§ 68. 145

II. Man in Relation to Sex and Race.

§ 69 147

III. The Constituent Parts of Man.

§ 70. Body, soul, spirit 149
§ 71. The heart, and its relation to the soul 152

Second Chapter. *The doctrine of man in reference to the contradictory elements which entered by sin into its development.*

I. The Primitive State of Man.

§ 72 156

II. Of Sin.

1. *The origin of sin.*
§ 73. The formal principle of sin 158
§ 74. The material principle of sin. The Old Testament names of sin 159
2. *The state of sin.*
§ 75. Sin as an inclination. Transmission of sin 161
§ 76. Antagonism of the good and the evil in man. Degrees of sin. Possibility of a relative righteousness 164

III. On Death and the State after Death.

§ 77. The connection between sin and death 166
§ 78-79. The doctrine of Mosaism on the condition after death 169

Third Division. The Covenant of God with Israel and the Theocracy.

First Chapter. *The nature of the Covenant.*

§ 80 Preliminary remarks and general survey 175

First Doctrine. The Divine Election.

§ 81. Israel's election as the full act of God's love 176
§ 82. Forms in which the election of the people is expressed 178

Second Doctrine. Man's Obligation.

PAGE
§ 83. The servant of Jehovah ... 181
§ 84. The Law ... 182
§ 85–86. The Decalogue. Its division ... 184
§ 87. Circumcision. Its historical origin ... 191
§ 88. Religious import of circumcision. The giving of a name ... 193

Third Doctrine. Divine Retribution.

§ 89. Blessing and curse ... 195
§ 90. Solution of the apparent contradiction between the Divine election and the Mosaic doctrine of retribution. Attacks on the latter ... 197

Second Chapter. *The Theocracy.*

§ 91. The idea of the Divine Kingship ... 199

First Doctrine. The Theocratic Organism, and the Ordinances of Law and Justice connected therewith.

I. Theocratic Organization of the People.
§ 92. The division into tribes. Israel's representation before Jehovah ... 200
1. *The Levites.*
§ 93. The mode and meaning of the representation of Israel by the Levites ... 203
§ 94. Official functions, dedication, and social position of the Levites ... 206
2. *The priesthood.*
§ 95 ... 209
3. *The high priest.*
§ 96 ... 214
II. The Theocratic Authority.
1. *The legislative authority.*
§ 97 ... 217
2. *The judicial power.*
§ 98. The principle and organization of the administration of justice ... 219
§ 99. The course of justice and punishment ... 221
3. *The executive power.*
§ 100 ... 223
III. The Organization of the Family, and the Legal Provisions Connected Therewith.
§ 101. The subdivisions of the tribes. The principles and division of Mosaic family law ... 225
1. *The law of marriage.*
§ 102. The contracting of marriage: the dependent position of the wife and the forms of the marriage contract ... 228
§ 103. Bars to marriage ... 228
§ 104. The dissolution of marriage ... 230
2. *The relation of parents to children.*
§ 105 ... 232

PAGE

3. *The law of inheritance, and provisions for the permanence of families and their inheritance.*

§ 106. The law of inheritance. Laws concerning heiresses and the levirate marriage 234

§ 107. Provisions concerning the preservation of the family inheritance .. 235

§ 108. The avenging of blood 238

4. *The rights of servants in the house* 239

§ 109. Bondage in the time of the patriarchs. The principles of the rights of bondmen 239

§ 110. The regulations concerning Hebrew servants 240

§ 111. The position of servants not Israelites 244

Second Doctrine. The Mosaic Public Worship.

§ 112. General introductory remarks. Essential character of this worship. 246

§ 113. The place of the word in public worship 248

Appendix: The oath 248

I. The Place of Worship.

§ 114. The requisites for a place of worship 250

§ 115. The arrangement of the Mosaic sanctuary 252

§ 116. Meaning of the sanctuary. Its three divisions 254

§ 117. Sacred vessels in the court and in the sanctuary 255

§ 118. The ark of the covenant, with the Kapporeth and the tables of the law 257

§ 119. The Cherubim 258

II. The Actions of the Mosaic Worship.

§ 120. Introductory remarks. On the idea of offerings in general 261

§ 121. Pre-Mosaic sacrifice and the Mosaic covenant. Sacrifice as the basis of the Mosaic sacrificial worship 263

1. *The material of the offerings.*

§ 122. Bloody and bloodless offerings 267

§ 123. The material of animal offerings 268

§ 124. The ingredients of the vegetable offerings. Salt in the offerings ... 270

§ 125. The principle on which the material of offerings was fixed 272

2. *The ritual of sacrifice.*

§ 126. The ritual of animal sacrifice. Presentation at the altar; laying on of hands; slaughter 274

§ 127. The use made of the shed blood 276

§ 128. The burning of the-offering 281

§ 129. Ritual of the food-offering 283

3. *On the various kinds of offerings with reference to their purpose.*

§ 130. Various kinds of offerings as thus distinguished 284

(*a*) *The burnt-offering.*

§ 131 285

(*b*) *The peace-offering.*

§ 132. Its name, notion, and division 287

§ 133. The ritual of the peace-offering 289

PAGE
§ 134. Of vows ... 292
§ 135. Nazaritism ... 294

Appendix. The theocratic taxes.

§ 136 ... 298

(*c*) *The atoning sacrifices.*

§ 137. The difference between the trespass-offering and the sin-offering with respect to the end in view ... 300
§ 138. The ritual and import of the trespass and the sin offerings. The trespass-offering ... 304
§ 139. The ritual of the sin-offering ... 305
§ 140. The ritual of the Day of Atonement ... 309
§ 141. Signification of the ritual and antiquity of the Day of Atonement ... 315

Appendix. Purifications.

§ 142. The Levitical purifications ... 319
§ 143. Acts of purifications for removing the suspicion of guilt ... 320

III. The Sacred Seasons.

1. *The Sacred Seasons in general.*

§ 144. Survey of the Sacred Seasons and their designations ... 323
§ 145. Reasons which determine the times of the feasts ... 324
§ 146. The celebration of the holy days ... 326

2. *The Sabbatical Seasons.*

(*a*) *The weekly Sabbath.*

§ 147. Antiquity and origin of the Sabbath ... 328
§ 148. The idea of the Sabbath ... 332
§ 149. The celebration of the Sabbath ... 334

(*b*) *The new moon Sabbath.*

§ 150 ... 336

(*c*) *The Sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee.*

§ 151. Legal enactments ... 337
§ 152. Import and practicability of the institution of the Sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee ... 342

3. *The three pilgrimage feasts.*

(*a*) *The Passover.*

§ 153. Enactments concerning the solemnity ... 345
§ 154. Significance of the feast of the passover, and questions connected with it ... 348

(*b*) *The feast of weeks (Pentecost).*

§ 155 ... 350

(*c*) *The feast of Tabernacles.*

§ 156 ... 351

PART II.—PROPHETISM.

First Section. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEOCRACY FROM THE DEATH OF JOSHUA TO THE CLOSE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION.

First Division. The Times of the Judges.

I. The Disintegration of the Theocracy till the Times of Samuel.

PAGE

§ 157. Course of events. Import of the office of Judge 353
§ 158. Religious condition. Decline of the theocratic institutions 355
§ 159. Religious syncretism of this period 359

II. Restoration of the Theocratic Unity by Samuel. Growth of Prophetism. Foundation of the Monarchy.

§ 160. The Philistine oppression. Changes effected by Samuel 361
§ 161. Nature, importance, and first beginnings of the prophetic office 362
§ 162. The so-called schools of the Prophets. The prophetic office of watchman 363
§ 163. The foundation of the Israelitish Kingdom : consecration of the king. 368

Second Division. Period of the Undivided Kingdom.

I. Saul.

§ 164 370

II. David.

§ 165. History of his reign. His theocratic position and personal religious development 371
§ 166. The form of worship under David 376

III. Solomon.

§ 167. The building of the temple 378
§ 168. Significance and dedication of the temple 380
§ 169. Hebrew proverbial poetry. The Hhakhamim 382
§ 170. Solomon's external organizations. The dark sides of his reign. Division of the Kingdom 384

Third Division. The Kingdom of the Ten Tribes.

§ 171. Preliminary remarks.

First Period. *From Jeroboam I. to the overthrow of the dynasty of Omri.*

§ 172. Jeroboam I. to Omri 387
§ 173. The dynasty of Omri 390
§ 174. Schools of the Prophets and characteristics of the prophetism of the period. The Rechabites 392

Second Period. *From Jehu to the overthrow of the kingdom of the ten tribes.*

§ 175. The dynasty of Jehu 395
§ 176. From Zachariah to the carrying away of the ten tribes 396
§ 177. Origin of the Samaritans 399

Fourth Division. THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH.

PAGE
§ 178. Preliminary remarks and survey 400

FIRST PERIOD. *From Rehoboam to Ahaz.*

§ 179. Rehoboam to Jehoshaphat 403
§ 180. Jehoram to Jotham 404

SECOND PERIOD. *From Ahaz to Josiah.*

§ 181. Ahaz and Hezekiah 408
§ 182. Manasseh and Amon 412

THIRD PERIOD. *From Josiah to the overthrow of the state.*

§ 183. Josiah 414
§ 184. Profane history of this period. Death of Josiah. Jehoahaz 416
§ 185. Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin 417
§ 186. Zedekiah. Fall of the State and of Jerusalem 419
§ 187. Gedeliah and the remnant of the people 421

Fifth Division. HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION FROM THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY TO THE CESSATION OF PROPHECY.

§ 188. Condition of the people and agency of the Prophets during the Captivity 422
§ 189. Deliverance and return of Jews from Babylon. Commencement of the rebuilding of the temple 424
§ 190. The period from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspis 427
§ 191. The Jews under Xerxes. Beginning of Ezra's administration 428
§ 192. Ezra and Nehemiah. The close of prophecy 431
§ 193. The beginning of Sopherism. Public worship at the close of this period 434

SECOND SECTION. THE THEOLOGY OF PROPHETISM.

§ 194. Summary 437

First Division. THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD OF HOSTS AND OF ANGELS.

§ 195. Form and occurrence of this name of God. Partial views concerning its original meaning 437
§ 196. The host of heaven. The heavenly bodies 439
§ 197. The host of the heavenly spirits 441
§ 198. Result with respect to the name Jehovah Sabaoth 443
§ 199. Angels of higher order and special office 444
§ 200. The doctrine of Satan 448

Second Division. MAN'S RELIGIOUS AND MORAL RELATION TO GOD.

I. DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE CEREMONIAL AND THE MORAL LAW.
§ 201 451

II. THE RUINOUS NATURE OF SIN. THE NEED OF A NEW DISPENSATION OF GRACE.
§ 202 455

III. Justification by Faith.

PAGE

§ 203. The Old Testament form of faith 459
§ 204. The Old Testament experience of salvation 461

Third Division. Of Prophecy.

First Subdivision. The prophetic consciousness.

§ 205. Negative propositions 464
§ 206. Positive propositions 465
§ 207. Psychological definition of the prophetic state in ancient times 468
§ 208. Phase of this subject under Protestant theology 471
§ 209. Continuity and elevation of the individual life in the prophetic state 473
§ 210. Prophecy an inward intuition 474
§ 211. The prophetic state illustrated by analogies: Dreams. Communion with God in prayer 478
§ 212. The conceptions of genius and the natural powers of divination 481

Second Subdivision. Of prophecy.

§ 213. Its office in general 484
§ 214. The prediction of particular events an essential element of prophecy. 486
§ 215–216. The peculiarities of Old Testament prophecy 488

Fourth Division. Of the Kingdom of God.

§ 217. Survey 494

First Subdivision. The purpose of God's Kingdom; the contradiction thereto presented by the present; the abolition of this contradiction by judgment.

I. The Design of God's Kingdom.

§ 218 495

II. The Relation of the Present to the Purpose of the Divine Kingdom.

§ 219 497

III. The Judgment.

§ 220. The day of the Lord. The judgment upon the Covenant people 499
§ 221. The judgment upon the heathen nations 501

Second Subdivision. The future Redemption.

I. The Deliverance and Restoration of the Covenant People.

§ 222. The restoration of Israel a necessary event 505
§ 223. The remnant of Jacob. The new covenant an everlasting one. The forgiveness of sins. The outpouring of the Spirit 506
§ 224. Other features of the times of redemption 509
§ 225, 226. Death destroyed 511

II. The Admission of the Heathen into the Kingdom of God.

§ 227. The extension of the Kingdom of God in the times of redemption. 516
§ 228. The conditions under which the admission of the heathen into the Kingdom of God is to take place 518

III. The Messiah.

PAGE

§ 229. Twofold view of the consummation of redemption. The word Messiah. The roots of the Messianic hope in the Pentateuch..... 521
§ 230. The promise in 2 Sam. vii. as the foundation of the Messianic idea in its stricter sense..... 523
§ 231. The development of the idea of the Messiah in the Prophets; the older prophetic writings; the prophetic doctrine concerning the nature of the Messiah..... 526
§ 232 234. The office and work of the Messiah..... 530

PART III.—OLD TESTAMENT WISDOM.

§ 235, 236. General preliminary remarks..... 537–539

I. Objective Divine Wisdom.

§ 237. The part of wisdom as an attribute of God in the universe. Its personification.
§ 238. The Old Testament view of nature..... 541
§ 239. The intervention of wisdom in human affairs..... 545

II. Subjective Human Wisdom.

§ 240. The fear of the Lord the subjective principle of wisdom..... 546
§ 241, 242. Practical wisdom..... 547–548

III. Moral Good.

§ 243. Its realization in the individual life..... 550
§ 244. Realization of moral good in the various social spheres. The view taken in Proverbs of evil and pain..... 553

IV. The Enigmas of Human Life. The Struggle for this Solution.

§ 245. The enigmas themselves..... 556
§ 246. The struggle to solve the enigmas relating to this subject in the Psalms..... 558
§ 247, 248. Solution of the enigmas in the Book of Job..... 561–564

V. Renunciation of the Solution in the Book of Ecclesiastes.

§ 249. Standpoint of this Book. Inquiry concerning divine retribution and immortality..... 565
§ 250. Moral teaching of the Book. Conclusion..... 568
Index of names and subjects..... 571
Index of texts..... 581

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE.*

WITHIN the last few years it has frequently been said, especially in ecclesiastical meetings, that a special need of the age is a fuller recognition of the importance of the Old Testament for religious knowledge and life, and that the treasures of this book, so little known, especially to so-called persons of culture, should be more fully laid open to the body of the Church. To this end the first requisite is, that *theologians* form a more thorough acquaintance with the Old Testament, especially that they become more familiar with it *as a whole*. It is true of every intellectual product, that it cannot be properly estimated by those who concern themselves merely with its external features, or with individual fragments of it; and of the Bible this is peculiarly true. What is unfolded in the Scriptures is one great economy of salvation—*unum continuum systema*, as Bengel puts it—an organism of divine acts and testimonies, which, beginning in Genesis with the creation, advances progressively to its completion in the person and work of Christ, and is to find its close in the new heaven and earth predicted in the Apocalypse; and it is only in connection with this whole that the details can be properly estimated. He who has not learned to understand the Old Testament in its historical connection may bring to light much that is valuable and worth knowing in respect to particular things, but he lacks the right key to its meaning, and therefore true joy in the study of it; he easily stumbles at the puzzles which lie everywhere on the surface of the Old Testament, and from them he condemns the whole. Now, to introduce to the organic historical knowledge of the Old Testament is the object of the branch of study to which these lectures are to be devoted. We must not think its dignity impaired by meeting the practical want indicated above; nay, in general, he is no true theologian who leaves an open breach between science and life. We claim for Old Testament Theology also no small importance for science, especially for *Systematic Theology*. This importance it possesses as a part of Biblical Theology, since, in virtue of the Protestant principle of the authority of Scripture, every question for which the Protestant theologian seeks an answer leads back, directly or indirectly, to Scripture, and the historical investigation of the divine revelation it contains.

In its development as an independent science, Biblical Theology is one of the most recent branches of theology. We shall see by and by that the name and conception of Biblical Theology as a special historical science arose only in the

* Delivered at the beginning of the course, in October, 1870. A few of the first sentences, as being of only passing interest, are omitted.—D.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.

Summary.

The Introduction has—

1. To *define* the theology of the Old Testament, and its relation to the cognate branches of biblical science.
2. To present the *conception* of the Old Testament religion presupposed in our exhibition of the subject, together with the scientific *standpoint* of Old Testament theology thereby given.

Followed by—

3. A survey of the *history* of this branch of theology ; and
4. A discussion of the *method* of Old Testament theology, and its *divisions*.

I.—DEFINITION AND LIMITS OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

§ 2.

DEFINITION OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. IT EMBRACES THE WHOLE FIELD OF REVELATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The theology of the Old Testament, the first main division of Biblical Theology, is *the historical exhibition of the development of the religion contained in the canonical books of the Old Testament.*

As a *historical* science, Biblical Theology is distinguished from the *systematic* statement of biblical doctrine by this, that while the latter investigates the unity of divine truth, as seen in the *whole course* of revelation, and the aggregate of its manifestations, the former has the task of exhibiting the religion of the Bible, according to its *progressive development* and the *variety of the forms in which it appears.* The theology of the Old Testament has therefore to follow the *gradual progress* by which the Old Testament revelation advanced to the completion of salvation in Christ ; and to bring into view from all sides the *forms in which, under the Old Covenant*, the communion between God and man found expression.

Now, since the Old Testament revelation (cf. § 6) did not present itself simply in words and as a divine testimony concerning doctrine, but was made in a connected course of divine deeds and institutions, and on the basis of these produced a peculiarly shaped religious life ; and further, since all knowledge derived

from revelation is not given independently of the facts of the history of salvation and the divinely instituted rules of life, but develops itself in continual connection with them ; it follows that the theology of the Old Testament cannot limit itself to the directly didactic matter in the Old Testament. It must embrace the essential factors of the history of the divine kingdom in the Old Covenant : its task is, in short, the *exhibition of the whole of the Old Testament dispensation* (1).

Even on this view of the subject, the name Old Testament Theology is still too broad (2), but it is at least more appropriate than other names which have been chosen for the exhibition of the Old Testament revelation, particularly than the term, Old Testament Dogmatics (3).

(1) This conception of the theology of the Old Testament is in accordance with the conception of Biblical Theology presented by Ch. Fr. Schmid (in a treatise *On the Interests and Position of the Biblical Theology of the New Testament in our Time*, Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1838 ; and in his well-known *Handbook of New Testament Theology*). This conception has, however, met with much opposition. The common conception is, that this branch should limit itself to the exhibition of the specially *didactic* contents of both Testaments. But here arises in the Old Testament the great difficulty, that this contains proportionally very little directly didactic matter. A separate exhibition of Old Testament religious teaching is, to be sure, possible ; but if it is not to prove quite incomplete, it will not be able to dispense with a reference at all points to the *history* of the covenant people and the institutions of the theocracy. This has been distinctly recognized even by Steudel (*Vorlesungen über die Theol. des A. T.*, 1840), although he limits this branch to the exhibition of the doctrines of the Old Testament. He says with truth (p. 18 f.) : "We should form for ourselves an incomplete idea of the substance of the Old Testament religion, and of biblical religion in general, if we looked upon it only as *doctrine*. It is *facts* which, with the greatest distinctness, are held before us as the source of the growth of religious conceptions and religious life. It was not on the basis of consciousness that objective views in religion established themselves. Consciousness did not create the thing held forth as fact ; but, on the contrary, the consciousness was produced by the facts, and often the facts lie before us, from which at a later time was deduced the religious element which they represented and offered as their lesson." Now, although this is recognized by biblical theologians, it has been generally thought to be sufficient to give a merely introductory survey of the history of revelation, as has been done by Steudel, and also by Schultz, in the most recent Old Testament Theology. But on this plan it is not possible to exhibit properly the internal connection of the doctrine of Revelation with the revealing history—the continual progress of the former in connection with the latter. We include, therefore, in Old Testament Theology the *chief features of the history* of the divine kingdom in the Old Covenant.

(2) Properly speaking, all the biblical branches, viz. Biblical Introduction, Hermeneutics, etc., should be included under the name Biblical Theology, as has been done by Rosenkranz in his *Encyclopædia of Theological Science*, and by others.

(3) The term *Dogmatics* (which De Wette and Rosenkranz substitute), or even *History of Old Testament Doctrine*, is not appropriate for the exhibition of the doctrinal contents of the Old Testament, even if we extend the notion of Dogmatics (see Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, p. 11) to the practical sphere, in the sense of *δόγματα*, Eph. ii. 15, Col. ii. 14. Dogmas, the positive doctrines of faith and life which demand acknowledgment and obedience, are found in the Old Testament, for the most part only in the Pentateuch (as, for example, the imposing passage : "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah"—Deut. vi. 4). The further development of religious knowledge, which is found in the prophetic books, the Psalms,

and the books of the Hhokhma (Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes), are inaccurately characterized by this expression. Even the prophetic announcements of the Messiah and His kingdom, of the resurrection of the dead, and the like, first became doctrinal propositions—essential parts of religious confession—from the standpoint of the New Testament fulfilment. Still less does that wrestling of the Israelitish spirit with the problems of life, brought out in many Psalms and in the book of Job, lead to a doctrinal result. The theology of the Old Testament has to handle as such *what is only in germ*, and of the nature of presentiment; it has to show how the Old Testament, in the narrowness and unfinished state which characterizes in many parts its doctrinal contents, points from itself to something higher. The Old Testament is of course treated differently by the later Judaism. Judaism finds in the Old Testament the *completion* of dogma, as Mohammedanism does in the Koran. However, it is characteristic of the Jewish theology that it always takes pains to prove from the Pentateuch even the doctrines primarily drawn from prophecy, such as those of the Messiah and the resurrection, in order to invest them with a doctrinal character.

§ 3.

RELATION OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY TO OTHER OLD TESTAMENT BRANCHES.

Among the other branches of Old Testament study, what is called *Introduction to the Old Testament*, or the history of the Old Testament writings, falls quite outside of the sphere of Old Testament Theology; they stand, however, in a relation of *mutual dependence on each other*, in virtue of which the criticism of the Old Testament writings must also have respect to the results of Old Testament Theology (1). On the other hand, Old Testament Theology has a part of its contents in common with *Biblical Archæology*, which treats of the whole natural and social condition of the old Israelitish people; for, in fact, all the important relations of life in Israel are treated as parts of religion, and belong essentially to the manifestation of the Old Testament religion, because the stamp of the communion of the people with the holy covenant God was to be imprinted upon them. Still, even such common constituents in the above-mentioned branches will demand in each case a treatment differing not merely in fulness, but in some measure also in form. With regard to the ordinances of worship, the theology of the Old Testament must treat of these so far as the communion of God and the people is carried out in them, and as they consequently present a system of religious symbols. On the other hand, the discussion of all purely technical questions must be left to archæology (2).

Finally, as to the relation of Old Testament Theology to the *Israelitish history*, the former has certainly to present the leading features in the facts of revelation which form the historical basis of the Old Testament religion, and in the divine leading of Israel; but only as this history lived in the spirit of the organs of revelation, and was the object of religious faith. It is bound to reproduce faithfully, and without admixture of modern ways of looking at history, the view which the Holy Scriptures themselves give of the purpose of salvation which is carried out in Israel. The history of Israel, on the other hand, has not only to present all sides of the historical development of the people of Israel, even in its purely secular connections, thus necessitating the examination of chronological and such like questions, but to sift and vindicate, by historico-critical research,

the real historical facts which the theology of the Old Testament reproduces as the contents of faith (3).

(1) The prevalent manner of treating Biblical Theology places it in an entirely one-sided relation of dependence upon the criticism of the biblical writings. This process is described by Rothe, for instance (*Zur Dogmatik*, p. 304 ff.), as follows: "In order to extract the actual facts of revelation from the Bible, the theologian must beforehand, by critical methods, make the Bible 'available' for his purpose. For only when he has completed his investigation of the origin of the biblical books, and has tested on this basis their value as historical sources, can he gain from them, as far as they are interpreted, the true teachings of revelation." There would be nothing to object against this proposition of Rothe, were it not that the position toward the *contents* of the records of revelation, which the critic takes beforehand, in many respects determines for him the way in which he conceives of the origin of the biblical books. If a critic takes a view of revelation which is far from harmonious with the biblical one, and devises a scheme of sacred history which the history itself does not acknowledge, he will of course from these presuppositions judge of the time when these books originated, and of other things, quite differently from what they themselves testify. Besides, Rothe does not himself claim for the critic an absolute freedom from all preconceived opinions, for he says, p. 309: "The one important point here is, that to us revelation is in itself, apart from the Bible, actually a reality. He before whose eyes, by means of the Bible as its record, revelation stands, in all its living majesty, as a mighty historical fact, can confidently exercise the most thorough and impartial criticism on the Holy Scriptures; he takes toward it *as a believer*, a free position, without any anxiety whatever."

On the point "that revelation in itself, aside from the Bible, is something real," there can be no reasonable controversy. The Bible is not revelation itself; it is the record of revelation. Neither do we deny the proposition, that he to whom the reality of revelation is made certain by means of the Bible as its record, takes toward the Scriptures "a free position of faith." But now, if it is only *through* the Bible that the theologian receives this impression of the majesty of revelation as a mighty historical fact, it should rather be expected of him that, before he criticises the Bible, he should first surrender himself to its contents without preconceived opinions—should let the revelation in its majesty work directly upon him, in order, as Rothe (p. 329) strikingly expresses it, "to make it a constant factor in the experiences of his personal life." He who has won in this way the conviction that Holy Scripture is the truly witnessing record of the divine purpose of salvation, and of the historical facts which serve to its realization, and that in it is contained the word of God as the means by which every one can lay hold of salvation—he, in the joyful consciousness of his faith in revelation, will certainly refuse to be bound by human traditions concerning Holy Scripture, whether these originated with the Jewish scribes or with the ancient Church, or with our older Protestant theology, whatever be the respect which he may feel due to them; but neither will he surrender himself to a criticism in which we can everywhere see that it does not rest upon the consciousness of faith which Rothe commends. He knows that a criticism, with the results of which this treatment of the Bible is incompatible, cannot have found the truth, because it fails to explain that which the Bible in the Church has proved itself to be, and so leaves unsolved the very problem of historical criticism—the explanation of the facts. He simply makes the inquiry, What sort of a Bible would be the result of the factors which that criticism employs? Would it be a Bible which presents to us this grand course of development of revelation, this grand system of facts and witnesses through the written word? which, moreover, finds its proof in men's hearts, as the Bible has done for two thousand years? Especially in regard to the *Old Testament*, the believer in revelation recognizes it as his task, before all things, to follow the gradual path

of development presented therein, and at the same time to value the continuous connection in which the Old Testament Scriptures stand to the ever-advancing revelation. In this respect it is inexplicable, when, for example, Schultz in his recent *Theology of the Old Testament*, which contains so much excellent matter, on the one hand sets Moses so high as an organ of revelation, but thinks this man, who lived in an age in which, as shown by the Egyptian antiquities, writing was quite a familiar art, to have written absolutely nothing but a few scanty scraps. We must not forget that the Old Testament Scriptures stand in such essential connection with the history of revelation, that the fulfiller of Old Testament revelation could at the same time represent himself as the fulfiller of Old Testament Scripture.

As regards the *mutual relations between Introduction and Old Testament Theology*, it will often be shown in the course of this work how the Old Testament, in reference to its didactic contents, presents not a uniform (completed) whole, but a regular progression of religious knowledge. Moreover, not only must the general view which we have of the gradual progress of Old Testament revelation influence our determination of the position which is due to any one book in the whole of the Old Testament, but the criticism of the Old Testament must pay regard to the course of development of the individual doctrines of the Old Testament. For example, how is a genetic exhibition of the Old Testament doctrine of the nature and attributes of God, of angelology, of the doctrine of the state of man after death, etc., possible, on the presupposition that the Pentateuch is a comparatively recent production? We shall see how in many cases the Pentateuch manifestly contains that which constitutes the basis for the development of the didactic matter in Prophecy and Hhokhma [for definition of this term see § 235]. This is a feature which the criticism of the Old Testament books, as a rule, either completely overlooks or handles in the most superficial manner. It is, to be sure, no proof that the Pentateuch in its present form is a production of Moses; but it does show the relative age of the Pentateuch, even in its construction, as compared with the prophetical books.

(2) The definition of archæology given in the text is that of Gesenius (*Hall. Encyklop.*, x. 74) and De Wette (*Lehrbuch der hebr. jüd. Arch.* § 1 and 2), with which Keil (*Handb. der bibl. Arch.* § 1) agrees, according to which it has to exhibit the forms of life in Israel as the people elected to be the bearer of revelation.

(3) In reference to the *relation of Old Testament Theology to the history of Israel*, I agree with Schmid (comp. § ii. 1) and differ most from the ordinary view. That history contains a series of facts which form the basis of the Old Testament religion. If we deny the exodus of Israel from Egypt, and the giving of the law from Sinai, the Old Testment religion floats in the air. Such facts can no more be separated from the religion of the Old Testament than the historical facts of Christ's person can be from Christianity. Hence Old Testament theology must embrace the chief facts in the history of the divine kingdom, since it must present the Old Testament religion not only as doctrine, but in the whole compass of its manifestation. But because it ought to report what men in the Old Testament believed, in what faith they lived and died, it has to exhibit the history *as Israel believed it*. As it cannot be our task in an Old Testament Theology to harmonize the Old Testament history of creation and other things of this kind with the propositions of the newer physical sciences, we have only, in the exhibition of the history of revelation, to reproduce the view which Holy Scripture itself has. With ethnological and geographical research and the like we have nothing to do. We thus conceive of the relation of the theology of the Old Testament to the Israelitish history, in a manner similar to that in which C. F. Nägelsbach, in his excellent and well-known work, has placed the relations of the Homeric theology to mythology, when he states, as the object of the former (Preface to *Homerische Theol.* ed. 2, p. xiv.), to give "the knowledge which Homer's men had of the Deity, and the effects produced by this knowledge in life and faith," and, on the other hand, makes the work of the mythologist to consist in "the criticism and deciphering of the historical development of mythological representations."

That Old Testament Theology has a *history*, as its critical sister science, while Homeric theology has only a *mythology*, is owing to the different character of the two religions. Here, indeed, there must be strife between those who—and I avow myself to belong to this class—acknowledge as facts what the Old Testament religion lays down as such. and are consequently convinced that the *thing believed* was also a thing which *took place;* and between those who see in the Old Testament faith mainly a product of religious *ideas*, the historical basis of which can be ascertained only by a critical process resting on rationalistic presuppositions. The latter party, who despise the key offered by the Old Testament itself for the comprehension of its history, have been so fortunate in their attempts at explanation, as to have turned the providential leading of Israel into a dark riddle. (Rosenkranz, in his biography of Hegel, p. 49, informs us that the Jewish history repelled him (Hegel) just as violently as it captivated him, and troubled him like a dark riddle all his life.) But whoever occupies the historico-critical standpoint on this subject should endeavor to get at the point of view of the Bible itself in its purity, without admixture of modern views. In the common treatment of the theology of the Old Testament, however, we find a peculiar lack of firmness; where it is acknowledged that the Old Testament religion rests on facts, what these facts are is stated as indefinitely as possible. On the other hand, no criticism has as yet robbed of its force the judgment of Herder respecting the history of the Old Testament: "A thing of that kind cannot be invented; such history, with all that depends on it, and all that is connected with it—in short, such a people cannot be a fiction. Its yet uncompleted providential guidance is the greatest poem of the ages, and advances probably (we say *certainly*, on the ground of Rom. xi. 25 ff.) to the solution of the mysterious riddle of the world's history."

§ 4.

SOURCES OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

The Theology of the Old Testament, according to the definition in § 2, must limit itself to the books of the Old Testament *canon* as received by the scribes in Palestine, and acknowledged by the Protestant Church, thus excluding the *Apocrypha*. For the canonical writings alone are a record of the history of revelation, and a genuine production of the spirit, which ruled as the principle of life in the Old Testament economy. According to the declarations of Christ in Luke xxiv. 44, Matt. xi. 13, etc., and the whole apostolic doctrine, there can be no doubt concerning the limits of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant (1).

Looking from the biblical standpoint, a specific difference must be made between the *law*, which claims divine authority, and the [human] *prescriptions* added to it and fencing it round—between *prophecy*, which knows itself to be the organ of the Divine Spirit, and the scribes in their collective capacity, who lean only on human authority, since, even to a man so eminent as Ezra, who stands at the head of the latter, the authority of an organ of revelation is not ascribed (2). It may be said, perhaps, that the distinction between the Hagiographa and the Apocryphal books is incapable of precise determination (as also that the composition of some of the Hagiographa falls later than the epoch which is marked by the silence of prophecy). Yet even in the better Apocryphal books it is impossible to ignore a lack of the depth of meaning that is found in the Old Testament, and in many cases an admixture of foreign elements (3). At all events, as soon as the theology of the Old Testament goes beyond the canonical books, there is no firm principle on which to fix its limits (4). [Prof. W.

Robertson Smith (*Old Testament*, p. 141) has well stated the case: "They (the Apocryphal books) were not only written after the end of the living progress of the Old Testament revelation, but their contents add nothing to our knowledge of that progress, and therefore, on a purely historical argument, and without going into any knotty theological questions as to the precise nature of inspiration, we can say on broad grounds of common-sense that these books must not be included in the Bible record, but that their value is simply that of documents for the history of the connection of the Old and the New Testament." Comp. also Ewald (*Lehre vom Worte Gottes*) to the same effect.—D.]

(1) In most statements of Old Testament theology the so-called *Apocrypha* is included (Schultz, p. 15 ff., excludes it). In this way the significance of the Old Testament *canon* is lost sight of. We take the following *lemmata* from the Introduction to the Old Testament (compare my article, "*Kanon des A. T.*," in Herzog's *Theol. Real-Encyklop.* vii. p. 244 ff.). The Hebrew writings in the Old Testament form one corpus, which consists of three parts: 1. תּוֹרָה, the Pentateuch; 2. נְבִיאִים, including (*a*) רִאשׁוֹנִים, *the earlier prophets*, the historical books from Joshua to Kings—(*b*) אַחֲרוֹנִים, *the later prophets*, consisting of the three greater and the twelve lesser prophets; 3. כְּתוּבִים, Hagiographa. From this comes the full title of the Hebrew Bible, תורה נביאים וכתובים. With the books contained in the Hebrew Bible are united, in the Alexandrian translation, a number of writings of later origin, and thus a more extensive collection of Old Testament writings has been formed. On the question, what value should be attached to the writings added in the Greek Bible, in comparison with those in the Hebrew collection, the dispute has been chiefly as to the recognition of the bounds of the Old Testament canon in the Christian Church. The Catholic Church sanctioned as canonical at the Council of Trent the books which are added in the Septuagint, called in the early Church Anagignoskomena or ecclesiastical lessons (hence a Theology of the Old Testament from the standpoint of the Romish Church must of necessity embrace the theology of these books). But the Protestant Church, following the example of Jerome, gives the Anagignoskomena of the Romish Church the not quite suitable name of Apocrypha, and rejects them. That the canon of the Protestant Church is that of the Judaism of Palestine is not disputed. As certainly must it be maintained, that the canon of the Judaism of Palestine, as established in the last century before Christ, and then re-sanctioned after temporary hesitation at the Sanhedrim in Jamnia toward the end of the first century of our era [about A.D. 90] or a few years later, did not, as has been maintained, rest upon an interest of a simply literary nature, viz., to unite all the remains of Hebrew writings which were still to be had; for then it would be inconceivable why it did not embrace the book of the Son of Sirach, which long existed in the original Hebrew text. The point in question in the collection of the Old Testament writings was rather, as Josephus distinctly says in the well-known passage on the canon (*c. Ap.* i. 8), concerning the *δικαίως θεία πεπιστευμένα βιβλία*. In the same passage Josephus limits the Old Testament canon to the time of Artaxerxes, because from that time forward an exact succession of prophets is wanting. It may be said that this is an arbitrary limitation of the Palestinian scribes, and it has lately become the fashion (Ewald, Dillmann, Noeldeke) to efface this distinction between canonical and non-canonical Scriptures. But if we look into the *New Testament*, no doubt can remain as to where the Old and the New Covenants are connected; since even the beginning of the New Testament history of revelation attaches itself directly (comp. Matt. xi. 13 f.) to the close of Old Testament prophecy in Malachi.—A sharp controversy on the Apocrypha was carried on about the middle of the present century among the German theologians. On both sides weighty arguments were brought forward along with many controversial exaggerations. The conclusion reached is,

that that word of the Old Testament, which is so often referred to in the New Testament as a *fulfilled* word, is found only in the writings of the Hebrew canon; that even if we admit as possible that there are allusions in some of the epistles, particularly the Epistle of James, to passages in the book of the Son of Sirach and the book of Wisdom, "yet there is never more than a simple allusion, and never a quotation properly so called," as even Stier, who is particularly zealous in searching out such correspondences (*l. c.* p. 12), candidly acknowledges.

(2) With Graf (*The Historical Books of the Old Testament*, 1866), the criticism of the *Pentateuch* has taken the turn, that many, declaring the legislation of Deuteronomy to be older than the law in the middle books, regard the Pentateuch as having reached its final shape only in the time of Ezra through the labors of a supplementing editor. But it is historically certain that, in the time after the exile, the Pentateuch was regarded as an inviolable whole, because of which the *fencing in* (סְיָג) of the Pentateuch then began with those ordinances to which our Lord assumes an attitude quite different from His relation to the *νόμος*. Conf. § 192 and Strack's art. "*Kanon des A. T.*," in Herzog, 2d ed. [On the appearance of Graf's treatise, an account of which will be found in the Bibliotheca Sacra, Oct. 1880 and July, 1882, it was promptly reviewed by Ewald in the Göttingen, *Gelehrte Anzeiger*, June 1866, pp. 985–991, who pronounced it deficient in thoroughness, superficial and unsatisfactory. He says, "Whoever adopts the opinion that the middle books of the Pentateuch were written after Deuteronomy will never be able to prove it, to say nothing of the fact that we should then be obliged to regard the contents of these books as imaginary and unhistorical." The theory, however, of the Levitical law as being of later origin than the earlier prophetical books, was defended by Reuss, who claims to be its author, Kuenen, Wellhausen, and others, and has been made familiar to the English and American public by Prof. W. Robertson Smith in his lectures on *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1881, and the article "Israel" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, by Wellhausen. On the other hand it is repudiated by Dillmann, whose eminence in Hebrew scholarship and special familiarity with the Levitical legislation entitle his opinion to respectful attention, Bredenkamp, *Gesetz u. Propheten*, 1880, and Delitzsch in a series of articles in Luthard's *Zeitschrift*, 1880. In America the work of Prof. Curtiss on *The Levitical Priests*, 1877, is directed against the Graf-Wellhausen theory on the single point that previous to the exile the priesthood was not confined to the family of Aaron, and that all Levites might be priests; Prof. Green of Princeton, in *Moses and the Prophets*, 1883, has examined the views of Prof. Smith and Kuenen, and assigned his reasons for rejecting them, which has also been done by writers in the *Presbyterian Review* and other quarterlies. Conf. also the art. "*Pentateuch*" by Strack in the 2d ed. of Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* Particular points in this controversy will be found discussed in the notes of this edition of Oehler. It can only here be said that the theory of development applied to the Old Testament in the central proposition that the ritual law or Levitical legislation is the latest product of the Old Testament development and belongs to the period of the second temple, while ardently embraced by some in Germany and elsewhere, is regarded by most scholars as wholly unsupported by facts, and as requiring too many assumptions to render it worthy of acceptance.—D.]

(3) This is especially true of the celebrated book of the Son of Sirach, which, to mention only a single point, presses the Pentateuchal doctrine of retribution to an offensive Eudæmonism, without any consideration of the features through which the Old Testament itself breaks through the externalism of the doctrine of retribution. (See my remarks on the theological character of the book in the article, "Pædagogik des A. T.," in Schmid's *Pædagog. Encyklop.* V. p. 694 f.). The same thing is true of the book of *Wisdom*, the most beautiful and excellent of the books of the Apocrypha. The ideas of the Greek philosophy are united in it with Old Testament doctrine, without any organic union of these elements. A tendency to syncretism [a mingling of ideas from other religions] is character-

istic of the later Jewish theology ; whereas, in the development of the Old Testament religion presented in the canonical writings, the fundamental principle of the latter has force sufficient to subdue and assimilate the foreign elements which are taken up. This may be seen especially in the traditions of Genesis and the institutions of the Mosaic worship, and also in doctrines of the later books, such as the doctrine of Satan and the Angels, if we assume in these cases, as is generally done, the presence of a foreign influence.

(4) No settled types of doctrine are found in the Old Testament Apocrypha. A thorough statement of the doctrinal system of the Book of Wisdom would bring us to the discussion of Jewish Alexandrinism. If the historical influence of the forms of post-canonical Judaism on the development of *Christian* doctrine were attempted, we should have to take up, along with the history of the Jewish Alexandrian philosophy of religion, the no less interesting and important history of the *Jewish Apocalyptic books*, the book of Enoch, the fourth book of Ezra, and the Psalter of Solomon ; and further still, the Jewish religious sects, and the earlier Rabbinic theology found in the older Targums and Midrashim, as well as in the Mishna, etc., would have to be discussed, as is done in the treatises of De Wette and von Cölln. Instead of burdening the Old Testament with such ballast, it will be more proper to refer the delineation of post-canonical Judaism to a special theological science to which Schneckenburger (in the lectures published by Loehlein, 1862) has given the name of the History of the Times of the New Testament. [Since Schneckenburger, the same subject has been treated by several writers—by Holtzmann, Hausrath, and finally by Schürer, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1874.—Eng. Ed.]

II.—FULLER STATEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC STANDPOINT OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

§ 5.

THE VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT RELIGION PROPER TO CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

The *Christian theological standpoint* for the theology of the Old Testament is already expressed *in its name*, by virtue of which it does not treat its subject as the *Jewish religion*, but as the *divine revelation of the Old Covenant*, which on the one hand is fundamentally different from all heathen religions, and on the other forms the preliminary stage to the revelation of the *New Covenant*, which is with it comprehended in one divine economy of salvation (1). Since the definition of Old Testament revelation will be discussed more fully further on (comp. § 55 ff.), only the more general propositions will here be stated.

(1) That view of the Old Testament which is now prominent in claiming that it seeks to understand the Old Testament historically, and yet at the same time to be just to its religious value, amounts essentially to this : that Israel, by virtue of a certain genius for religion rooted in the natural peculiarity of the Semitic race, was more successful in the search after the true religion than the other nations of antiquity, and soared higher than the rest toward the purest divine thoughts and endeavors. As the Greeks in the ancient world were the people of art and philosophy, and the Romans the people of law, so the people of religion κατ' ἐξοχήν sprang by natural growth from the Semitic stem. While it pleased the *earlier rationalists* to reduce the contents of the Old Testament as much as possible to things of little value, and then to condemn the whole as Jewish national delusion, this newer view, whose principal representative is *Ewald*,

fully recognizes the depth of thought and moral loftiness of the Old Testament; indeed, it finds there already, more or less distinctly expressed, the eternal truths which Christianity subsequently placed in full light. [As Dorner (*Hist. of Prot. Theology*, ii. 436) sharply states it: He suppresses all that is new in the New Testament, and makes it nothing more than a purified Judaism.—D.]

Yet, although individual contributions made to the matter of Old Testament theology from this standpoint have great value, the Old Testament can never be historically understood in this way. Does even a single page of the Old Testament agree with this view, by which Israel is represented as a people of such genius in the production of religious thought, and the Old Testament religion as a natural product of the Israelitish spirit? All that the Bible recognizes is the decided *opposition* in which the Old Testament religion stood from the very beginning to all that Israel had sought and found in the path of nature. And how this view fails to recognize the difficulty of the *divine tuition* expressed in Isa. xliii. 24: "Thou hast made me *labor* with thy sins, thou hast *wearied* me with thine iniquities." In Jer. ii. 10 f. we find Israel's position toward revelation distinctly characterized. When it is there said, "Pass over to the isles of Chittim, and see; and send unto Kedar, and consider diligently, and see if there be such a thing: Hath a nation changed its gods, which are yet no gods? but my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit," this charge becomes intelligible, if we remember that the gods of the heathens were a production of the natural national mind, but not so the God of Israel. And therefore the heathen nations do not exchange their gods—so long, that is, as their religions thus originated have power to develop organically; but Israel had to exercise on itself a certain compulsion in order to rise to the sphere of the spiritual Jehovah-worship, and therefore it sought after the gods of the heathen—this borrowing from other religions, in fact, being characteristic of Israel, so far as it was not subject to revelation.

The entire Old Testament remains a sealed book, if we fail to see that the subduing of the natural character of the people is the whole aim of the divine tuition, and that therefore the whole providential guidance of the nation moves in this antagonism. [From the point of view here controverted, the objection might arise that as in every department of mental activity the mass of the people occupy a lower position than that of the more gifted intellects, while yet we regard the latter as the highest development of a nation's mind (the Greek philosophy, for example, as a production of the Greek national mind), so the loftiest religious teachings found in the prophets may be regarded as the highest development of the Israelitish national mind. This objection would hold good, if the struggle which goes through the whole history of Israel, between what Israel should be and what it was, had respect only to such an antagonism as we find, for instance, in the reproof in Is. i. or subsequently between John the Baptist and the Pharisees. But the antagonism which really appears is one entirely different. The struggle maintained by Moses and the prophets is not a struggle on the part of those who have embraced the religious principle in its purity and truth, against the mass who stand upon a lower plane and are under the influence of sense, but it is a struggle of men who remain true to the God who has revealed himself to their fathers, against the mass who have apostatized to *strange* gods and to strange religions. Not bondage to sense but *unfaithfulness* is the charge against the people made by the true servants of Jehovah.]

§ 6.

THE BIBLICAL IDEA OF REVELATION. I. GENERAL AND SPECIAL REVELATION.

The Biblical idea of revelation has its root in the idea of Creation. Revelation is the development of the relation in which God has placed Himself to the world in bringing it into existence. The basis of revelation is laid in the fact that the

world was called into existence by the *word* of God, and was animated by His *Spirit*. The production of different classes of beings advances teleologically, and reaches its goal only when God has created man in His own image. In this progression the foundation of revelation is laid. For *revelation is, in general, God's witness and communication of Himself to the world for the realization of the end of creation*, and for the re-establishment of the full communion of man with God. After the tearing asunder through sin of the bond of the original communion of man with God, God testifies, partly in nature and the historical guidance of mankind, and partly in each one's conscience, of His power, goodness, and justice, and thus draws man to seek God ; comp. how the Old Testament points to this witness of God, which is perceptible even to the heathen, in Isa. xl. 21–26 ; Jer. x.; Ps. xix. 2 ff., xciv. 8–10 (1). The outer and inner forms of this *universal revelation* stand in a continual relation of reciprocity, since man's inward experience of the divine testimony is awakened through the objective outward witness of God ; but this outward witness is first understood by the inward (see Acts xvii. 28, in its relation to ver. 27). Yet the personal communion of man with God, as demanded by his ideal constitution, is not recovered by means of this general revelation. The living God remains to the natural man, in all his searchings, a hidden God (comp. Isa. xlv. 15 ; Jer. xxiii. 18 ; John i. 18). The knowledge of His ἀίδιος δύναμις καὶ θειότης does not in fact lead to the knowledge of the true and living God, nor does the testimony of conscience that we are bound to Him produce a personal vital communion with Him. Nay, conscience rather testifies to man of his separation from God, and that he has disowned the being of God attested to him in nature and history ; whence the Old Testament calls the heathen "those that forget God," Ps. ix. 18 (2). It is only by God's stooping to man in personal testimony to Himself, and by the objective presentation of Himself, that a vital communion is actually established between Him and man. This is the *special revelation* (3), which first appears in the form of a covenant between God and a chosen race, and the founding of a kingdom of God among the latter, culminates in the manifestation of God in the flesh, advances from this point to the gathering of a people of God in all nations, and is completed in the making of a new heaven and a new earth (Isa. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22 ; Rev. xxi. 1 ff.), where God shall be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28). The relation between general and special revelation is such, that the former is the continual basis of the latter, the latter the aim and completion of the former, as, according to the Old Testament view, the covenant in the theocracy is presupposed in the worldwide covenant with Noah. As in nature each realm has its own laws, and yet the several realms stand in inseparable connection, since the lower steps always form a basis for the higher, and the higher a continuation and completion of the lower, so the general and special revelations, the order of nature and of salvation in the system of the world, are knit together in organic unity, as, according to the doctrine of the New Testament, the Logos is the Mediator of both (4).

(1) What is called the *physico-theological, the moral evidence of God's existence*, etc., is repeatedly presented in the Old Testament in a popular form ; it occurs in the protest of the prophets against heathenism. Comp. Isa. xl. 21–26 : "Do ye not know ? do ye not hear ? hath it not been told you from the beginning ? have ye no understanding of the founding of the earth ? He that sits enthroned

over the circle of the earth . . . that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain . . . that bringeth the princes to nothing, and maketh the judges of the earth like a waste," etc. Ver. 24 points to the starry sky. Jer. x. brings to mind the living God who rules in the universe. Ps. xix. 2 ff. shows specially how God has revealed His splendor and order-establishing sway in the sun and its course. Ps. xciv. 9 presents the argument: "He who plants the ear, shall He not hear? He who formed the eye, shall not He see?" This verse admits of no difference of exposition. The thought is this: the Creator of hearing and sight must Himself have an analogous knowledge—must be a living God, who sees all things, and hears prayer. Ver. 10: "He who chastises the nations, shall not He punish, He, who teaches man knowledge?" is often explained thus: He who punishes the nations in general, shall not He also punish in the actual case which is before us? To me, the exposition of Hupfeld and Hitzig appears to be more correct, according to which the יסר גוים refers to divine correction in man's conscience. Then we get a good parallelism to the second member. The verse is thus a reference to the revelation of God in man's conscience and reason: He who has given conscience and reason, He who proclaims Himself in them to be a God of retribution, should He not also proclaim Himself so in reality, in His providences toward the nations?

2. The expression שכחי אלהים, Ps. ix. 18, is not, with Umbreit, to be connected directly with the forgetting of a purer ancient religion, but with the forgetting and denying of God's testimony, as it comes continually to the גוים themselves.

3. In treating of *special revelation*, we meet one prominent point of difference between the Biblical idea of revelation and the idea usually developed in the so-called *Vermittlungstheologie* (comp. Schultz's *Old Testament Theol.*). This school limits the idea of revelation as much as possible to the *inner* life of man; revelation is made to consist essentially in a divine "self-communication through man inspired of God." Revelation operates by working in the heart of man "an immediate certainty of divine life" (s. Schultz, p. 61, and my review in Luthardt und Andreas, *Allg. Luther. Annalen*, 1870, p. 104 f.). The objective facts are not entirely denied; it is not denied that events did occur in the history of the Israelites to which that inward self-communication of God to the prophets of whom Moses may be regarded as the first attaches itself. But the objective personal self-presentation of God which the Bible undoubtedly asserts is not admitted, for fear of too dangerous an approach to the sphere of the miraculous, or else it is spoken of in a very indefinite way. [Comp. the chapter on Moses in Schultz, especially p. 129 ff.] "But [to this it may be answered] if revelation is at bottom only God's communication of Himself through inspired men, if it acts only to awaken in the mind of certain chosen men an immediate certainty of the divine existence, no specific difference between a prophet and a heathen sage can be made out; for even in the heathen an immediate certainty of the divine existence existed. In order that such a relation of personal communion between God and man as the idea of humanity requires may exist, we must have that objective presentation of Himself by God which is pointed out in the word, "Here am I." Isa. lii. 6, lxv. 1.

Luther, for example, has with reason, in his commentary on Ps. xviii. (*Exegetica opera latina*, Erl. Ausg. xvi. p. 71), pointed out how, from the beginning, the divine governments aimed at binding the revelation of God to a given object: "Voluit enim dominus et ab initio semper id curavit, ut esset aliquod monumentum et signum memoriale externum, quo alligaret fidem credentium in se, ne addiscerentur variis et peregrinis fervoribus in spontaneas religiones seu potius idololatrias." Divine revelation must enter the world as a proclamation, in which the personality of God as such meets man, not as an inexpressible *numen* or Divinity, but as God Himself. When that is made clear to us, we discern the educational character of the divine forms of revelation. To mankind in its childhood God's existence must be taught in theophany from without, and then

from that point revelation advances toward the manifestation of the reality of this God in the spirit (comp. § 55).

(4) If an *older supernaturalistic view* places revelation in the more restricted sense in direct opposition to the order of nature, and represents special revelation as entering into the world as a *Deus ex machina*, this is in nowise the biblical view.

§ 7.

II. HISTORICAL CHARACTER AND GRADUAL PROGRESS OF REVELATION. ITS RELATION TO THE WHOLE OF MAN'S LIFE.

Its Supernatural Character.

According to this, the special revelation of God, since it enters the sphere of human life, observes the laws of historical development which are grounded in the general divine system of the world. It does not at a bound enter the world all finished and complete; but from a limited and relatively incomplete beginning, confining itself to one separate people and race, it advances to its completion in Christ in a gradual manner corresponding to the natural development of mankind, and guides that development into the path of the divine order of salvation, so as to communicate to man, by an historical process, the fulness of God which Christ bears in Himself. And because revelation aims at the restoration of full communion between God and man, it is directed *to the whole of man's life.* It does not complete its work by operating either exclusively or mainly upon man's faculties of knowledge; but constantly advancing, it produces and shapes the communion of God and man, as well by divine witness in word as by manifestations of God in the visible world, the institution of a commonwealth and its regulations, revelations of God within, the sending of the Spirit, and spiritual awakenings; and all this so that a *constant relation exists between the revealing history of salvation and the revealing word*, inasmuch as each divine fact is preceded by the word which discloses the counsel of God (Amos iii. 7) now to be completed; and again, the word of God arises from the completed fact, and testifies thereto (1). In these operations revelation makes itself known *as differing from the natural revelations of the human mind,* not only by the *continuity and the organic connection of the facts which constitute the history of salvation*, but also in its special character (*miracle*), which points distinctly to a divine causality. It is recognized by the organs of revelation themselves through a special influence of the Spirit, of which they are conscious as a divine *inspiration*, and finally, by all who in faith accept revelation, through their *own experience of salvation* (2).

(1) Biblical revelation, as here defined, is distinguished from the view of the older Protestant theology in two respects. On the old view, revelation was essentially, and almost exclusively, regarded as *doctrine.* In other words, what was urged was chiefly the influence of God on human *knowledge*—a defect which appeared still more one-sidedly in the older supernaturalism, which regarded revelation as concerned with the communication of a higher knowledge, which human reason either would not have found at all, or, as the rationalistic supernaturalism teaches, at least not so soon nor so perfectly. But if this was all, it would in fact have been better if it had pleased God to send directly from heaven a ready-made system of doctrine. This is, as is well known, the Mohammedan idea of revelation. And what need was there of this vast historical ap-

paratus in order simply to bring to the world a divine doctrine which was then to be accredited by the facts of revelation? The second point in which the older view of revelation was unjust to the biblical one, was the failure to recognize *the gradual development* which revelation passes through in the Scripture itself. The Bible, as the record of the teachings of revelation, was supposed to attest equally, in the Old and New Testaments, the truths which the Church has accepted as doctrines; the doctrine of the Trinity, for example, was found in the Old Testament.

If we look into the Scriptures, we see that, without doubt, revelation has to do with an influence on man's *knowledge*, but not this exclusively, and never so as to make this stand in the foreground. A people of God is to be created from our sinful race; a community having in itself divine life is to be planted, and mankind thus to be transformed into a kingdom of God, a tabernacle of God among men (Rev. xxi.). Revelation, then, cannot possibly confine itself to the cognitive side of man. Biblical Theology must be a theology of divine *facts;* not, indeed, in the limited view which has been taken (comp. Ad. Koehler's paper in Ullmann's *Stud. u. Krit.* 1852, p. 875 ff.), as if the work of revelation simply consisted in divine acts and then all knowledge originated merely through reflection on the facts of revelation;—on a similarly limited view of Hofmann, in his *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, comp. § 14. The matter stands thus: between the facts or the history of revelation on one side and the testimony of the divine word on the other, a *mutual correspondence* exists: for example, the flood is announced as a divine judgment—the threatening word precedes it; and then, after the fact has taken place, a further word of God grows from it. This goes on down to the resurrection of our Lord.—Amos iii. 7: "The Lord Jehovah does nothing without revealing His secret to His servants the prophets." This passage points to the close connection of the words and facts of divine revelation.

(2) The true definition of miracle and inspiration will be discussed further on. —The living *experience of salvation* is indeed first found complete on the basis of the New Testament revelation. It is there the testimony of the new creature, who knows that what he owes to the word of God differs specifically from that which he could have found in the path of nature. But in the Old Testament also there lies a mighty witness in the passage, "Who is a God like unto Thee?" (Ex. xv. 11), as well as in the acknowledgment that Israel had a law such as no other people on earth had (Deut. iv. 6–8; Ps. cxlvii. 19 f., etc.).

§ 8.

III. THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS IN THEIR RELATION TO HEATHENISM AND TO EACH OTHER.

Revelation falls into two principal divisions, the *Old* and the *New Testaments*, which stand to each other in the relation of preparation and fulfilment, and are thus, as a connected dispensation of salvation, distinguished from all other religions. Comp. specially Eph. ii. 12 (1). The law and the prophets are *fulfilled* in Christianity; while, on the contrary, the heathen religions are not fulfilled in Christianity, but come to naught. It is true that heathenism was a preparation for Christianity, not simply negatively by the exhaustion of the forms of religious life which it produced, and the making felt the need of salvation, but also, by bringing the intellectual and moral powers of the human soul to a richer development, it added to the gospel—which seeks to enlist in its service all the powers of man's nature—many homogeneous elements, thus opening to the truth many paths among men. But heathenism not only lacks the series of divine facts through which the way was prepared for the completion of salvation in Christ, and like-

wise all *knowledge* concerning the divine counsel of salvation (comp. Isa. xli. 22, xliii. 9 ff., xliv. 7 ff., etc.) (2); but it has not so much as prepared the human basis from which the redemption of man could historically proceed. For, on the one hand, all heathen culture, even if capable of being shaped by revelation, is yet no *necessary condition* for the redemptive operation of the gospel, 1 Cor. i. 18–30; and, on the other hand, heathenism, which has no knowledge of the *holiness* of God, and so no full idea of *sin*, but only a keen sense of *injustice*, lacks those conditions under which alone a sphere of life could be generated which presented a fit soil for the founding of the work of redemption (cf. Rothe's *Theol. Ethik*, 2d ed. ii. p. 120 ff.) (3).

But the *unity* of the Old and New Testaments must not be understood as *identity*. The *Old Testament itself*, while it regards the decree of salvation revealed in it, and the kingdom of God founded thereupon, as eternal, as extending to all times and to all races of men (from Gen. xii. 3 onward, comp. also the parallel passages; further, Isa. xlv. 23 f., liv. 10, etc.), acknowledges that the manifestation of God's kingdom at that time was imperfect and temporary; for it points forward to a new revelation, in which that which is *demanded* by the letter of the law and *signified* by its ordinances shall become a *reality* through divine communication of life (comp. Deut. xxx. 6); indeed, at the very time in which the old form of the theocracy was overthrown, it predicted the new eternal covenant which God would make with His people (Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.) (4).—But still more distinctly does the *New Testament* emphasize the difference from the Old which subsists within the unity of the two covenants. The eternal counsel of salvation, although announced by the prophets, is nevertheless not completely revealed till after its actual realization (Rom. xvi. 25 f.; 1 Pet. i. 10 ff.; Eph. i. 9 f., iii. 5). The tuition of the law reached its goal in the grace and truth of Christ (John i. 17; Rom. x. 4; Gal. iii. 24 f.). In the saving benefits of the new covenant, the shadow of the old dispensation passes into reality (Col. ii. 17; Heb. x. 1 ff.): therefore the greatest man in the old covenant is less than the least in the kingdom of Christ (Matt. xi. 11); indeed, the Old Testament teachings and institutions, divested of their fulfilment in Christ, sink down into poor and beggarly rudiments (Gal. iv. 9) (5).

(1) According to Eph. ii. 12, the heathen, as *ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*, are also *ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*. Israel has hope, the heathen are *ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες*: Israel has the living God, the heathen are *ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*.

(2) What did *heathenism* ever transmit to the coming generations after its bloom was dead, as the work of its seers and oracles? What permanent knowledge to comfort men and inspire them with hope in times of trouble? The answer to this can only be, that heathen divination which searched heaven and earth to find signs of God's will, which even knocked in its questionings at the gates of the kingdom of death, which listened for the divine voice in the depth of the human breast, never gained a knowledge of the counsel of the living God; so that the old heathenism at the close of its development stood helpless—in spite of all its searching, possessing no key to the understanding of God's ways, and no knowledge of the goal of history. Or did not its knowledge of the divine counsel take refuge in *poetry*, *philosophy*, and *political wisdom*, when the mind of man emancipated itself from the decaying power of divination? The idea of a providence, of a moral order of the world, everywhere appears, no doubt, as a witness of the religious constitution of man and the indestructible power of conscience.

But with this thought wrestles the belief in dark fate; and this, as is forcibly brought out by Wuttke (*Geschichte des Heidenthums*, i. p. 98), is "the evil *conscience* of heathenism continually admonishing and tormenting—the consciousness of guilt on the part of the gods making it more and more evident that they are not what they ought to be; that they are of this world, while they ought to be a spiritual power over it, and therefore bear in themselves the germ of death."—Whether destiny or virtue determines the world, or how the operations of both are divided, is a riddle which ever turns up unsolved, although boldly answered now in this way, now in that. Observe, for example, to cite but a few instances, how a Demosthenes at first testifies to the reign of divine justice in the history of nations; how he prophetically announces the fall of the power which rests on falsehood and perjury; how he concedes, indeed, that destiny determines the issue of all things, but holds its gifts of fortune possible only where there exists a moral claim on the favor of the gods (*Olynth.* ii. 10. 22); and how, in the evening of his life, he knows no better explanation of the misfortune of his people than that the destiny of all men, as it rules at present, is hard and dreadful, and that therefore even Athens must receive its share of the misfortune common to man, in spite of its own good fortune (*de cor.* p. 311). Or see how a Plutarch, who, in his remarkable book on the late execution of divine punishment, shows a deeper understanding of the divine method of judgment, but acknowledges in his consolatory epistle to Apollonius, chap. vi. ff., no higher law for human things than the law of change—see how he answers the above-mentioned question in his treatise on the fate of Rome; how he seeks to comprehend the course of the history of the world by the combination of the two principles, destiny and virtue. He teaches (chap. ii.), that as in the universe the earth has established itself gradually out of the conflict and tumult of elementary matter, and has lent to the other things a firm position, so it is with the history of man. The greatest kingdoms in the world were driven about and came into collision with each other by chance, and thus began a total confusion and destruction of all things. Then Time, which with the Godhead founded Rome, mixed fortune and virtue, in order that, taking from both what was their own, it might set up for all men a holy hearth, an abiding stay and eternal foundation, an anchor for things driven about amid storm and waves. Thus in the Roman empire the weightiest matters attained stability and security; everything is in order, and has entered on an immovable orbit of government. [*Programm über das Verhältniss der alttest. Prophetie zur heidnischen Mantik*, 1861.]

(3) In asserting on biblical grounds *the essential connection of the Old and New Testaments*, we stand in opposition to that view of the Old Testament especially which has been advanced by Schleiermacher in his *Glaubenslehre*. Schleiermacher's position (§ 12) is this: "Christianity stands, indeed, in a special historical connection with Judaism; but in respect to its historical existence and aim, its relation to Judaism and to heathenism is the same." The more this view of the Old Testament has become prevalent, as it has in late years, the more necessary is it to look at it closely. [Ritschl, in his *Christian Doctrine of Justification*, opposes it.] When Schleiermacher, in *the first place*, bases his proposition on the assertion that Judaism required to be re-fashioned by means of non-Jewish elements *before Christianity could proceed from it*, this is an assertion in the highest degree contrary to history. For to what does Christ attach His gospel of the kingdom? Is it to Judaism as re-shaped by Greek philosophy into Hellenism? or is it not rather to the *law and promise* of the Old Covenant? Even where the New Testament comes into connection with ideas of Alexandrian Judaism, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is still an essential difference between that Alexandrian self-redemption and the Christian facts of redemption. This is so clear and certain, that it is not necessary to waste words upon the subject. Rather we must say, conversely, that heathenism, *before receiving Christianity, had to be prepared monotheistically;* which was mainly effected by that mission of the Jewish Diaspora, which had so great an influence on the Roman world. Schleiermacher is right when he argues, in the *second*

place, that it is possible to pass *directly from heathenism to Christianity* without passing through Judaism ; but it must be remembered, that in heathenism the training of the law is partly supplied by conscience (Ep. to the Romans), and that even the gospel includes the preaching of the law, when it commences with the word "Repent." To Schleiermacher's *third* objection, that though Christ sprang out of Judaism, yet many more heathens than Jews have embraced Christianity, we have to say that Israel hardened its heart because it had from the first a possession which it deemed sufficient, while in heathenism a conscious need of salvation and a seeking after God existed.

Nägelsbach has well pointed out (*Vorrede zur homer. Theol.*, 2d ed. p. xix.) how the "seeking after God was the living pulse in the whole religious development of antiquity." "But," he continues, "it is clear as can be, that this seeking was much further developed in the vague feeling of want and a longing for its supply, than in the capacity to satisfy it by its own power." The attempts "to find the real and essential Deity" failed altogether. Schleiermacher's *fourth* argument is as follows : What is most valuable for the Christian use of the Old Testament is to be found also in the utterances of the nobler and purer heathenism—for example, in the Greek philosophy (a view often expressed ; comp. v. Lasaulx, *Socrates' Life, Teaching, and Death*, 1858); while, on the other hand, that is least valuable which is most distinctly Jewish. Now it is undoubtedly correct that much which belongs specifically to the Old Testament is abolished in the New Testament. But if we ask what is specific and essential in both the Old and New Testaments in opposition to heathenism, the answer is not Monotheism ; for there is a monotheistic heathenism as well, and heathenism wrestles to lay hold on the Deity as a unity ; but for the Old and New Testament in opposition to heathenism, the common bond is, above all, the knowledge of God's *holiness*. With this it follows, as shown in the text, that, because the heathen had not the knowledge of the divine holiness, they also had not a complete sense of *sin* (comp. the striking remarks of Carl Ludw. Roth in his critique of Nägelsbach's "Homer. Theol.," *Erlanger Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, i. 1841, p. 387 ff.). In regard to the alleged expressions in agreement with Christianity which can be traced in heathenism, it must be noticed that all those dispersed rays of light do not make a sun—that, with all these, the conditions were not given for the founding of a community of salvation.

It remains undeniable that the community which was gathered out of Israel forms the true root of the Christian Church (comp. Rom. xi.). With good reason has Steudel (in his *Theologie des A. T.* p. 541) met Schleiermacher with the question, where it could be said to the heathen in the same way as to the Jews : "He is come, to whom all the men of God have pointed, and for whom they have waited." This is not simply an external historical connection.

(4) It lies in the nature of the case, that the law at the time in which it was given did not present itself as a law to be abrogated, for thereby the law would have weakened itself. Certainly the Mosaic regulations are given very positively, as everlasting regulations, from which Israel was not to deviate ; but that the *position of the people toward the law* shall in the future be different from what it is in the present time, is stated in the Pentateuch very distinctly, viz., Deut. xxx. 6, where it is declared, that in the last times God will circumcise the *heart* of the people, and so will not meet them merely in the way of command, but will awaken in them a susceptibility for the fulfilment of the law. Thus the germ of the prophecy of a new covenant of an essentially different character, as it was uttered by Jeremiah in those very days when the battlements of the old city of David sank in the dust, lies already in the Pentateuch.

(5) Since such a difference exists between the Old and New Testaments—a difference which chiefly centres in the contrast between the law and the gospel—it is to be expected from the outset that with this practical difference a theoretical one must correspond, and that we shall not find in the Old Testament the metaphysical doctrines of Christianity. This is the point in which the earlier theology erred.

III.—HISTORY OF THE CULTIVATION OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH (1).

§ 9.

THEOLOGICAL VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE EARLY CHURCH AND IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

Old Testament Theology, as an independent branch of history, is, like Biblical Theology in general, a modern science. During the whole development of church doctrine down to the Reformation, and also in the old Protestant theology, no distinct line was drawn between the essential contents of revelation as they are laid down in the Scriptures, and the doctrinal formulas elaborated from them; and still less were the successive stages of revelation and types of doctrine which are presented in Scripture recognized. While, on the one hand, the early Church succeeded in overthrowing the heresy of Marcion, which completely severed Christianity from the Old Testament revelation, it did not avoid the opposite error of confounding the two Testaments. The proposition, *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet*, which is in itself correct, was so perverted as to be made to mean that the whole of Christian theology, veiled indeed, but already fully formed, could be shown to exist in the Old Testament (2). Especially was this the case in the *Alexandrian theology*, which changed the distinction between the law and the gospel into a mere difference of degree, and attributed to the prophets in general the same illumination as to the apostles (3).

But even those doctors of the Church who, like Augustine, more correctly apprehended the distinction between the law and the gospel, and the difference of degree between the revelation in the Old and in the New Testament with respect to the benefits of salvation, failed to recognize this difference in theory, and, so far as the more enlightened men of the Old Testament are concerned, almost entirely abandoned it (4). Still Augustine's treatment of Old Testament history in his work *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xv.–xvii., is not without interest in its bearing on Biblical Theology (5). On the other hand, the chronicle of Sulpicius Severus (6), which, in the first book and the beginning of the second, discourses compendiously on the whole Old Testament history, is of no importance to Biblical Theology, though it is not wanting in interest on individual points (7).

Still less was the cultivation of Biblical Theology as an historical science possible under the influence of the *theology of the middle ages*, or at all consistent with the tendencies of that period. Even the *mystical tendency*, which went back more to the Bible, was deficient in sound hermeneutical principles, and so, no less than *scholasticism*, did violence in its speculations to the Scriptures. Even those who, like the theologians of the School of St. Victor, had a presentiment of a more legitimate treatment of Scripture, were unable to carry their ideas out (8).

(1) This survey of the history of our science will show how far the view of the Old Testament which we have presented in the preceding pages has been adopted by those who have written on Old Testament theology. Comp. with this my *Prolegomena to the Theology of the Old Testament*, 1845 (also my article "Weissagung" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xvii.), and Diestel's *History of the Old Testament*

in the Christian Church, Jena, 1869. The very excellent work of Diestel not only gives a history of the way in which the Old Testament has been viewed and expounded in Christian theology, but seeks also to point out [though much more briefly than might be supposed from Oehler's statement—D.] the influence which the Old Testament has exercised in the course of centuries on the life of the Church, on its constitution, worship and doctrine, and on the arts and laws of Christian nations. This attempt has succeeded so well, that we find a tolerably complete mass of material brought together in a very instructive manner. (See my review of the work in Andreæ und Brachmann, *Allg. litterar. Anzeiger*, April, 1869, p. 245 ff.)

(2) The earliest treatment of the Old Testament, not simply practically, but theologically, is found in the New Testament ; comp. especially the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews. *The controversy between the young Christian body* and the wisdom of the scribes soon led to biblico-theological questions, and this was continued between the orthodox Church teachers and the heretics. The questions which, as we see from Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*, and Tertullian's *Answer to the Jews*, were chiefly discussed between Rabbins and Christian theologians, centred in Christology. On that topic we find such questions of debate as the following : Does the Old Testament teach the divine dignity of the Messiah, and does it announce a παθητὸς Χριστός ? In the *Gnostic* controversy, the whole position of Christianity toward the Old Testament became matter of discussion ; in particular, in opposition to the *Manicheans*, the question arose, which remains yet unsettled, viz., how it stands with the Old Testament in relation to the knowledge of the immortality of the soul and eternal life (comp. on this subject my *Commentationes ad theologiam biblicam pertinentes*, 1846, p. 2 ff.). But these questions were not treated in the way that is followed by Biblical Theology in the strict sense of the word, in which the historical interest is dominant, but purely in the interests of doctrine, so that the Church Fathers sought to point out the Christian doctrines as existing in the Old Testament ; and above all, their ignorance of the [Hebrew] language hindered the doctors of the Church from studying the Old Testament thoroughly. [From this remark, Origen, Jerome, and Ephrem Syrus must be excepted.—D.]

(3) On the position of the Alexandrian school to the Old Testament, and its confounding of the two Testaments, we refer especially to the account of Origen by Redepenning, *Origenes*, i. p. 273 ff. The allegorical interpretation, which he brought to its perfection, rendered Origen incapable of perceiving in the Old Testament a development of doctrine, and of representing the historical progress of revelation impartially.

(4) In proof of this, comp. Augustin. *c. Adim.* cap. iii. 4 : " Certis quibusdam umbris et figuris . . . populus ille tenebatur, qui Testamentum Vetus accepit : tamen in eo tanta prædicatio et prænunciatio Novi Testamenti est, *ut nulla* (in *Retract.* i. 22. 2 : *pæne* nulla) *in evangelica atque apostolica disciplina reperiantur, quamvis ardua et divina præcepta et promissa, quæ illis etiam libris veteribus desint.*"

(5) We may regard these three books in Augustine's great work as in a certain sense the first treatment of the theology of the Old Testament. Augustine (cf. *l.c.* xxii. 30 fin.; *c. Faust.* xii. 8) bases his statement on the thought that the history of the divine kingdom is comprised in seven periods, of which the week of creation forms the type. The first five periods fall in the Old Testament times, and are bounded by Noah, Abraham, David, the Babylonian captivity, and the appearing of Christ ; the sixth is the present age of the Church ; and the Sabbath of the world follows as the seventh. We shall see how, in the Reformed theology at a later period, this thought was used in what is called the system of periods (§ 11).

(6) In connection with the chronicle of Sulpicius Severus, which Diestel has singularly overlooked, the essay of Bernays deserves to be read : " *The Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus ; a contribution to the history of classical and biblical studies.*" 1861. The chronicle was written a little after A.D. 400.

(7) The study of the Old Testament in the ancient Church reaches its close

with Gregory the Great; but his gigantic work, *Moralia in Jobum*, and his other works on the Old Testament, are particularly important only so far as they make us more closely acquainted with the style of exegesis in the old Church.

(8) See Liebner, "*Hugo von St. Viktor und die theologischen Richtungen seiner Zeit*," 1832, p. 128 ff.—True, much detached matter valuable for the Old Testament was brought to light in the *middle ages*, and especially on the Song of Solomon, in which the mysticism of the middle ages lives and moves, as Bernard of Clairvaux's lectures on Canticles show; but this is not anything belonging to Biblical Theology. Nay, the simpler explanations of the Bible appeared so despicable to the ruling *scholasticism*, that the name, biblical theologian, came to mean the same as a narrow-minded person (see Liebner, *l.c.* p. 166). The Rabbins of the middle ages accomplished more, especially Moses Maimonides, who must often be consulted on Old Testament Theology, particularly on the ordinances and expositions of the Mosaic law.

§ 10.

THEOLOGICAL VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION.

The Reformation principle of the supreme authority of Scripture drew the attention of theologians to the Old Testament as well as to the New. A more lively interest in it had been already awakened by John Reuchlin; though in the case of Reuchlin himself this interest was directed less to the simple theological meaning of the Old Testament, than to the old mysterious learning it was supposed to contain. Nevertheless *Hieronymus redivivus*, as Reuchlin was called because of his *trilinguis eruditio*, rendered great service to the "rise of the Holy Scriptures," not simply by opening a path for the study of Hebrew in Germany, but particularly by the firmness with which he lays it down as the duty of the expositor of Scripture to go back to the original text expounded according to its literal sense, and to refuse to be dependent on the Vulgate, and the traditional expositions of the Church which are connected with it. Thus Reuchlin became the father of Protestant Hermeneutics, little as he himself acknowledged the full range of his principles (1). The recognition of the *difference between the law and the gospel* derived from Paul's epistles was the first thing that gave to the *Reformers* a key to the theological meaning of the Old Testament, since they sought in the Scriptures, not theurgic wisdom, like Reuchlin, but the simple way of salvation. Scholasticism had substituted for the antithesis of law and gospel the difference between the *vetus* and the *nova lex;* the former of which demands only a righteousness prompted by external motives, and therefore incomplete, while the latter binds to the complete virtue which rests upon love. Reformers, on the other hand, brought into a truer light the moral worth of the Old Testament law, and the corresponding educational aim of the Old Testament economy; and they also correctly recognized, that even in the old covenant a revelation of God's *gracious will* in the promise of salvation goes side by side with the revelation of the *demands* of the divine will in the law (2). Of all that is connected with this practical sphere in the Old Testament, *Luther* especially shows a profound understanding, springing from a lively personal experience (3). But because the experience of the *Christian*, even when analogous, is not necessarily identical with that of believers under the Old Testament, the practico-theological exposition does not do full justice to the historical meaning of the Old Testament. The

fact that moral and religious knowledge was *gradually* deepened under the educational guidance of the law, which advanced from the external to the internal; that the promise of salvation arose from germ-like beginnings, and advanced step by step in connection with the providential guidance of the history of the people, was all the less recognized, because in the sphere of doctrine proper the two Testaments were so closely blended. In the view which the Reformers (and especially Melanchthon) were fond of developing, that the Church began in Paradise and continues throughout all time, the whole emphasis is laid on the *doctrinal* unity of revelation, existing under all change of outward forms (4). Grace is indeed *multiformis*, adjusting its revelation according to the need of different times, and the childhood of the human race has special need of simple speech and story (5); but the faith of the Old Testament saints in the coming Saviour is nevertheless essentially one with our faith in the Saviour who has come (6). It is true that *exegesis* had become subject to the laws of language; the fourfold sense of the scholastics was set aside, and the simple *sensus literalis* was pressed; but the second principle of exegesis, the *analogia fidei*, though then in itself correctly understood as the *analogia scripturæ*—the rule that Scripture must be expounded by Scripture—was taken in the sense of full doctrinal agreement between the two Testaments (7). The *Reformed Theology*, which does not urge the antithesis of the law and the gospel in the same way as the Lutheran, agrees with it entirely as to the doctrinal use of the Old Testament. Even Calvin, who really laid a foundation for the historical exposition of the Old Testament, places the difference of the two Testaments mainly in the outward form, which changes according to the difference in man's powers of comprehension (8).

(1) Most writers content themselves with eulogizing the service which Reuchlin rendered in laying the foundation for the study of the Hebrew language in Germany. But he is also worthy of notice in a theological respect; though not, because of his cabalistic studies (*De verbo mirifico*, 1494; *De doctrina cabbalistica*, 1517), which were esteemed by himself as the crown of knowledge. The Reformers indulgently took no notice of his cabalisticism, though each one, from the sharp judgment to which Luther subjects the Jewish "Alfanzerei" in his book on the *Shem ham'phorash* might have his own opinion on what Reuchlin taught concerning "the miraculous word." But Reuchlin's immortal service consists in this, that he was the first to claim with the greatest emphasis that exegesis should be independent of the traditions of the Church, contained especially in the Vulgate and the commentaries of Jerome. From him sprang the well-known sentence: "*Quamquam Hieronymum sanctum veneror ut angelum et Lyram colo ut magistrum, tamen adoro veritatem ut Deum*" (Preface to the third book of the *Rudimenta Hebraica*); and he utters this principle, "Is est plane verus et germanus scripturæ sensus, quem nativa verbi cujusque proprietas expedita solet aperire," in his book, *De accentibus et orthographia linguæ hebraicæ*, fol. iii. b. This important service of Reuchlin was also acknowledged by Luther, when he wrote to him, 1518 (*Illustrium virorum epistolæ hebraicæ, græcæ et latinæ ad Joannem Reuchlin, etc.*, 1514 and 1518, 3 b.): "Fuisti tu sane organum consilii divini, sicut tibi ipsi incognitum, ita omnibus puræ theologiæ studiosis exspectatissimum." Reuchlin has also given his opinion on the duty of studying the Holy Scriptures independently in their original text, in his letters to Abbot Leonhard in Ottenbeuern (s. Schelhorn's *Amœnitates hist. eccl. et literar.* ii. p. 593 ff.). Among other things, he writes: "Tantus mihi est erga linguarum idiomata et proprietates ardor, ut non valde laborare consueverim librum habere aliquem in alia lingua, quam in ea, in qua est conditus omnium primo, semper ipse

timens de translatis, quæ me sæpe quondam errare fecerunt. Quare N. T. græce lego, Vetus hebraice, in cujus expositione malo confidere meo quam alterius ingenio." It is only too true that Reuchlin himself did not know the sweep of his own views; he was highly dissatisfied even with the Reformation. For the rest, comp. my biography of Reuchlin in Schmid's *Encyklop. des gesammten Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswesens*, and my review of Geiger's paper on Melanchthon's *Oratio continens historiam Capnionis*, 1868, in the *Zeitschr. für Luther. Theol.* 1869, iii. p. 505 ff.; and also of Geiger's book, *Johann Reuchlin, his Life and Works*, 1871, in the same *Zeitschr.* 1872, i. p. 145 ff. [also the book itself], and the art., *Reuchlin* in Herzog, *Encyk.*

(2) On this subject compare the first ed. of Melanchthon's *Loci*, in the *Corpus Reform.*, ed. Bretschneider and Bindseil, xxi. p. 139 ff.

(3) What the Old Testament testifies of the solemnity of the divine law and divine judgment, of the curse of sin and the wretchedness of a life without God, and also of the desire for forgiveness of sins and the purifying of the heart, and of faith in divine promises, in doctrine and history, is set forth by Luther with much impressiveness, especially in his *Exposition of the Psalms*, which, as the "Patternbook of all Saints," depicted the history of his own inward life.

(4) From Luther, compare especially, with regard to this, the exposition of Ps. xix. (xx.) in the *Exegetica opp.*, Lat. ed., Erl., xvi. p. 190 f.: "Sicut alia persona, alia causa, aliud tempus, alius locus in nova lege sunt, ita et aliud sacrificium, eadem tamen fides et idem spiritus per omnia sæcula, loca, opera, personas manent. *Externa variant, interna manent.*—Oportet enim ecclesiam ab initio mundi adstare Christo circumdatam varietate, et dispensatricem esse multiformis gratiæ Dei secundum diversitatem membrorum, temporum, locorum et causarum, quæ mutabilia sint et varia, ipsa tamen una semper eademque perseveret ecclesia." Grace has many forms, but the Church is *one;* and Luther would add, So is also Church *doctrine*. Luther finds the doctrine of the θεάνθρωπος even in Gen. iv. 1. It is remarkable that, side by side with his free position toward some of the Old Testament writings, there is a very decided strictness in regard to the doctrines supposed to lie in the Old Testament. From Melanchthon, comp. *Loci*, *Corpus ref.* xxi. p. 800: "Una est perpetua ecclesia Dei inde usque a creatione hominis et edita promissione post lapsum Adæ; sed doctrinæ propagatio alias in aliis politiis fuit. Ac prodest considerare seriem historiæ," etc.;—p. 801: "Nam ut sciremus, doctrinam ecclesiæ solam, primam et veram esse, Deus singulari beneficio scribi perpetuam historiam ab initio voluit . . . et huic libro . . . addidit testimonia editis ingentibus miraculis, ut sciremus, unde et quomodo ab initio propagata sit ecclesiæ *doctrina*."

(5) See Luther's preface to the Old Testament of 1523, *Works*, Erl. ed. lxiii. p. 8: "Here (in the Old Testament) shalt thou find the swaddling-clothes and the manger in which Christ lies.—Poor and of little value are the swaddling-clothes, but dear is Christ, the treasure that lies in them."

(6) Comp. Luther on Gal. iv. 2: "(Christus) patribus in V. T. in spiritu veniebat, antequam in carne appareret. Habebant illi in Spiritu Christum, in quem revelandum, ut nos in jam revelatum, credebant, ac æque per eum salvati sunt ut nos, juxta illud: 'Jesus Christus heri et hodie idem est et in sæcula' (Heb. xiii. 8)."

(7) On the hermeneutical principles of the Reformation theology, we give the following additional details:—The principle that the true meaning of each scriptural passage is the literal meaning, was taken from Reuchlin; Luther had spoken sharply against the making of allegories, and would tolerate allegories at best only as an ornament and setting, as he expressed it. To this was added the properly theological principle of exposition by the *analogia fidei*. This Protestant principle of the *analogia fidei* is different from that of the ancient Church. In the latter, the sum of the tradition of doctrine in the apostolic churches formed the *regula fidei;* but the *analogia fidei* of the Reformers was to be drawn from Holy Scripture, and so becomes *analogia scripturæ*—Scripture should be explained by Scripture. This principle is in itself perfectly correct; and to have

stated it, is one of the greatest merits of Protestant theology. But it was not properly applied ; the unity of the Old and New Testaments was conceived of not as produced by a gradually advancing process of development, but as a harmony of doctrine. In order to justify this, and to be able to show the doctrine to be really taught, it was necessary to use a figurative exegesis. This, as every one knows, is the kind of exegesis which takes the place of allegorizing interpretations, especially in the treatment of prophecy. Compare Luther's preface to the Old Testament, Erl. ed. lxiii. p. 22 : "Moses is the fountain of all wisdom and understanding, out of which welled all that was known, and told by all the prophets. The New Testament also flows from it, and is grounded therein.—If thou wilt interpret well and surely, take Christ for thee ; for He is the man to whom alone all refers. So, then, in the high priest Aaron see no one, but Christ alone," etc.

(8) Calvin was so much an historical expositor in his exposition of the prophets, that he was reproached later by the Lutheran controversialists as the *Judaizing* Calvin. But in the doctrinal treatment of the Old Testament he took a position as rigorous as that of Luther and Melanchthon, and indeed more so ; compare as the principal passage, the *Institutiones* of 1559, ii. chap. 11, "de differentia unius testamenti ab altero," § 1 f.: There are indeed differences between the Old and New Testaments, but they rather refer *ad modum administrationis* than *ad substantiam ;* the temporal promises of the Old Testament are a type of the heavenly inheritance. "Sub hac pædagogia illos continuit Dominus, ut spirituales promissiones non ita nudas et apertas illis daret, sed terrenis quodammodo adumbratas." Then it is said, § 13 : "In eo elucet Dei constantia, quod *eandem omnibus sæculis doctrinam* tradidit ; quem ab initio præcepit nominis sui cultum, in eo requirendo perseverat. Quod *externam formam et modum* mutavit in eo non se ostendit mutationi obnoxium : sed *hominum captui, qui varius ac mutabilis est, eatenus se attemperavit.*"

§ 11.

THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE OLDER PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.

The treatment of the Old Testament in the *older Protestant theology* was determined by the principles stated in the last paragraph. Because the doctrinal system of Protestantism sought to support itself wholly on the teachings of the Bible, the distinction between biblical theology and church doctrines was not carried out after the thread of œcumenico-catholic development of doctrine was again taken up. The contents of the Scriptures were set forth with strict regard to the systematic doctrines of the Church, and without respect to the historical manifoldness of the Scriptures themselves. The Old Testament was used in all its parts, just like the New Testament, for proofs of doctrine. In opposition to the *Romish theologians,—e.g.* Bellarmin, who now distinguished the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments as *doctrina inchoata* and *perfecta*, and maintained that the mysteries of faith, and especially the doctrine of the Trinity, were only obscurely and imperfectly contained in the Old Testament,—it was taught on the side of the Protestants, that, in respect to fundamental doctrines, the Old Testament was in no way incomplete, and that these were only repeated more distinctly in the New Testament (comp. for the Lutheran theology, Gerhard's *Loci*, ed. Cotta, vi. p. 138 (1); on the Reformed side, Schweizer, *Reformirte Glaubenslehre*, i. p. 212 f.). This was more sharply expressed in the struggle against the *Socinians ;* and the same point was

also in dispute in the *Syncretistic controversies*. Among the points which roused the Lutheran orthodoxy against George Calixtus, was his denial of the existence of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Old Testament. The first notable reaction against the scholastic treatment of the Old Testament proceeded from the *Reformed theology*, which took a wider interest than Lutheranism in the Scriptures as a whole. What is called the *system of periods*, and still more, the *Cocceian federal theology*, come now into view (2). The former was mainly grounded on the Apocalypse, which suggested the division of the history of the Christian Church into periods based on the number seven, which several times recurs in the book. In the Cocceian school this plan of division was extended to the Old Testament. *Cocceius* (born 1603 in Bremen, professor in Leyden 1650, died 1669) proceeded in his views on biblical theology from the idea of a twofold covenant between God and man: the first, the covenant of nature and works, was made with Adam in his state of innocence; the second, the covenant of grace and faith, which came in after the fall, has three dispensations—before the law, under the law, and under the gospel. Cocceius has the undeniable merit of having energetically defended the theological study of the Scriptures, in opposition to scholasticism and the exegetical tradition ruled by it, as well as in opposition to a one-sided philological exegesis. His principles of interpretation also deserve favorable recognition. The literal meaning must be given as exactly as possible, though with careful attention to the immediate context; but since the Scripture is an organism, the whole Scripture must always be kept in mind in the theological explanation of each passage. The allegorical principle of interpretation he rejected, but held to the typical teaching of the Old Testament concerning the Atonement, as distinguished from the atonement actually made as taught in the New Covenant. Indeed, it was one of the most controverted doctrines of Cocceius, that (comp. Rom. iii. 25, Heb. ix. 15) the Old Testament taught only a *πάρεσις ἁμαρτιῶν*, *transmissio peccatorum*, but not a real *ἄφεσις*. But the way in which Cocceius connected the different dispensations, and confounded the thought meant by the Holy Spirit with *his own* application to analogous times and occurrences in the Church, led to an arbitrariness of exegesis which has made Cocceianism proverbial (3). The remarkable manner in which on this system the history of the divine kingdom is embraced in an artificial schematism may be seen in Gürtler's *Systema theologiæ propheticæ*, 2d ed. 1724. (Gürtler makes three great periods,—the first from Adam to Moses, the second extending to the death of Christ, and the third to the end of the world; each of these is divided into seven periods, and the numerically corresponding periods in each of the three rows of seven are supposed to have also corresponding characteristics.) Among the pupils of Cocceius, the following did special service to biblical theology:—Momma, *De varia conditione et statu ecclesiæ Dei sub triplici œconomia;* the excellent Witsius, *On the Economy of the Covenants* (4); Vitringa, the famous commentator on Isaiah (*De synagoga vetere, Observationes sacræ;* and in particular, his *Hypotyposis historiæ et chronologiæ sacræ*). Among the opponents of Cocceius we name especially Melchior Leydecker (*De republica Hebræorum*, 1704). Among the Lutheran theologians, Joh. Heinrich Majus (Professor in Giessen) was specially influenced by the Reformed biblical theology (*Œconomia temporum V. T.*, 1712; *Synopsis theologiæ judaicæ*, 1698); his *Theologia prophetica ex selectioribus V. T.*

oraculis, 1710, claims particular notice, in which the *Theologia Davidis ex psalmis* appears as a distinct part, and along with it a *theologia Jesajana*, *theologia Jeremiana*, and a *theologia prophetica ex vatibus* xii. *minoribus*. The arrangement in these works, which are not without interest, follows that of the *Loci* in treatises on doctrinal theology (5).

(1) Gerhard lays down the following propositions : Quod ad rem ipsam sive mysteria fidei attinet, doctrina veteris testamenti *nequaquam est imperfecta*, siquidem *eosdem fundamentales fidei articulos* tradit, quos Christus et apostoli in novo testamento *repetunt*. Quod ad docendi modum attinet, fatemur, quædam fidei mysteria clarius et dilucidius in novo testamento expressa esse, sed hoc perfectioni reali nihil quidquam derogat, cum ad perspicuitatem potius pertineat quam ad res ipsas cognoscendas.

(2) [Socinus was not disposed to deny the divine origin of the Old Testament, but maintained that it was not essential for the establishment of Christian doctrine and possessed only a historical value. The connection of the two Testaments was made in a quite external way to consist chiefly in the fact that certain commands (viz., those of a moral nature) were common to both ; but beyond this a considerable difference was held to exist between the perfect commands and perfect promises of God in the New Testament and the commands and promises found in the Old, and it was especially charged upon the Old Testament that it only taught temporal rewards and punishments and restricted forgiveness to mere sins of infirmity.—*Prol.*]

To see how the orthodox view of the Old Testament was confirmed in the struggle against the *Socinians*, compare Diestel, "Uber die socinianische Anschauung vom A. T.," *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1862, p. 709 ff.; how, on the other side, a path was opened by the Reformed theology for a theology of the Old Testament, may be read in Diestel's "Studien zur Fœderaltheologie," in the same journal, 1865, p. 219 ff.

(3) The main work by Cocceius on this topic is the beautiful little book, *Summa doctrinæ de fœdere et testamento Dei*, ed. 2, 1654, 68 ; note specially the preface to this book, in order to value its position aright, as well as chapters eleventh and twelfth. There is nothing to be said against several of his principles of interpretation ; his *theory* is better than his practice. He has with great clearness charged exegesis with the task of freeing itself from the belittling style of hanging unduly on single texts, and of learning, on the other hand, to comprehend the Scriptures as an organism. But what was gained on the one side was lost on the other by the artificial parallels drawn between the various stages of revelation, and by the typical exposition which Cocceius used. From this arose that plurality of senses in interpretation which brought on him the reproach that he could make each passage mean everything ; and from this came such Cocceian oddities as the notion that Isa. xxxiii. 7, "Behold, their valiant ones shall cry without ; the ambassadors of peace shall weep bitterly," is a prophecy of the death of Gustavus Adolphus.—Among his pupils, Witsius and Vitringa in particular returned to more prudent paths.

(4) Witsius' work, *De œconomia fœderum Dei cum hominibus, libri quatuor* (ed. 4, 1712), [Eng. transl. 2 vols., London, 1840], contains what may be called a theology of the Old Testament in the first and fourth volumes, and still deserves to be known and valued ; in the treatment of the types, indeed (iv. 6), much that is irregular and arbitrary prevails, although he seeks to find general rules of procedure. (The conscientiousness of the writer appears in such passages as *Œc. fœd.* p. 639, where he says : in omnibus caute agendum est, *μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου*, ne mysteria fingamus ex proprio corde nostro, horsumve obtorto collo trahamus, quæ aliovorsum spectant. Injuria Deo et ipsius verbo fit, quando nostris inventis deberi volumus, ut sapienter aliquid dixisse vel fecisse videatur.) [Prol.]

(5) The writings of Majus are interesting in the first place, because he proceeds to consider separate books of Scripture in their theological import. This,

indeed, is carried out in an artificial way, for he simply takes the *loci* of the doctrinal system as his framework (Hengstenberg has done the same with the Psalms); but it is worth noticing what a fulness of theological matter is contained in many of the separate biblical books. Secondly, it is interesting to see how Majus, in his *Theologia prophetica*, places a *dictum classicum* at the head of each *locus*, which he treats as pertaining to the Old Testament theology, attaching to the interpretation of this leading passage his doctrinal matter; for example, the *locus* of the unity and trinity of God is headed by Deut. vi. 4, "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Lord!" the *locus* of the creation by Gen. i. 1, "In the beginning God created," etc.; the *locus* of sin by Ps. xiv. 3, "They are all gone aside," etc.; the *locus* of Christ by Prov. viii. 22, the passage on pre-existent Wisdom; the *locus de ecclesia* by Ps. xlvi. 5 f.

§ 12.

CONCEPTION AND TREATMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FROM THE END OF THE SEVENTEENTH TO THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

In the Lutheran Church, *collegia biblica*, or topical lectures, became common from the end of the seventeenth century onward (*e.g.* Schmid, *Collegium biblicum;* Baier, *Analysis et vindicatio illustriumscript. s. dictorum*). These lectures, which contained exegetico-dogmatical discussions of the most important proof-texts of the doctrines of the Church, gave some impulse to the study of biblical as distinguished from doctrinal theology, but cannot be regarded as of much consequence. The works on the *Church history of the Old Testament*, as they were called, which came out about the same time, are of more value for the theology of the Old Testament. The most important of these is the *Historia ecclesiastica veteris testamenti* of Buddeus, 3d, ed. vol. ii. 1726–29 (1). The biblicism of Spener and his school weakened the doctrinal rigor of the prevalent orthodoxy; but since the tendency of pietism [under his influence] was directed predominantly to practical expositions of Scripture, and the value of the separate portions of the Bible was measured by the degree of their adaptation to personal edification, pietism could not contribute to Biblical Theology as an historical science. The one circumstance which was valuable for prophetic theology was, that Spener did justice to the scriptural view of the completion in this world of the kingdom of God (2). *John Albrecht Bengel*, upon the ground of his view of the divine kingdom as an *œconomia divina circa mundum universum, circa genus humanum*, insisted on an organic and historical conception of biblical revelation with strict regard to the difference of its stages. The Würtemberg school, which took its origin from him, regarded as its task not only practical edification from separate Bible texts, but especially the awakening of a knowledge of salvation, resting on insight into the whole course of the divine kingdom (3). In this connection, Roos, Burk, Hiller (4), Oetinger, and others have advanced profound thoughts in a plain and simple form. The Leipzig theologian Christian August Crusius is akin to the school of Bengel: we name as his chief work the *Hypomnemata ad theologiam propheticam*, in three volumes (5). Still the seed scattered by Bengel and his school found little receptive ground amid the revolution which passed in the course of the eighteenth century over German Protestant theology. The *English deism* had become powerful in Germany also, and a one-sided subjectivism stepped into the place of the scholasticism of Church doctrine. Believing only in itself, it admitted that alone to be truth which man, alienated from the

Christian experience of salvation, undertook to evolve from himself. What is presented in the Bible as a revelation from God was explained as simply the work of individual men who undertook to found religions. The writings of the apologists, *Lardner*, *Warburton*, *Shuckford*, *Lilienthal* (*The Good Cause of Divine Revelation*, 16 parts) contributed indeed much important matter to the biblical branches of theology; but they could effect but little in opposition to their opponents, since they agreed with them in placing the biblical, and in particular the Old Testament institutions on the ground of bare utility (6). This system of referring the plan of the Old Testament revelation to prudential considerations of the most trifling character which J. Spencer (7) in his learned work, *De legibus Hebræorum ritualibus earumque rationibus*, 1686 (published again by Pfaff, 1732), and Clericus had introduced, became quite predominant in Germany through the works of the learned orientalist of Göttingen, Joh. David Michaelis, who, in his *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* (1770–1775) [London, 1814, 4 vols. 8vo], pressed the theory of utility to the utmost (8). Semler's tendency has a more ethical character. He regards that which is serviceable for *moral improvement*, not that which edifies the Christian, as the one thing of importance, and as that by which, therefore, in the Holy Scriptures, the divine and the human, the material and the immaterial, must be distinguished. He maintains none the less that the Bible and Church doctrine [i.e. the Lutheran theology] contradict each other,—a proposition which from his time onward was accepted equally by rationalists and supernaturalists. Thus Biblical Theology became completely freed from the theology of the Church creeds.

(1) Comp. Hengstenberg, * *History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament*, i. p. 80.

(2) Comp. on this point, and part of what follows, Delitzsch, *Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Chr. A. Crusius und ihre neueste Entwickelung*, 1845.

(3) Bengel himself wrote nothing on the Old Testament, except as his *Ordo temporum* includes the Old Testament. We must observe, however, that disjointed suggestive hints in connection with the Old Testament are to be found scattered everywhere in his numerous writings, also in his **Gnomon to the New Testament*, etc. The propositions in opposition to the dogmatism of the period in the *Ordo temporum*, chap. 8, "de futuris in scriptura provisis ac revelatis," ought especially to be noticed. In the second of the hermeneutical rules there given, Bengel states the proposition, which at that time was quite new (2d ed. p. 257): "*Gradatim* Deus in patefaciendis regni sui mysteriis progreditur, sive res ipsæ spectentur, sive tempora. *Opertum* tenetur initio, quod deinde *apertum* cernitur. *Quod quavis ætate datur*, id sancti debent amplecti, non plus sumere, non minus accipere."

(4) Magnus Friederich Roos is Bengel's most eminent pupil. Among his works we have here to mention: *Fundamenta psychologiæ ex sacra scriptura collecta*, a work rich in fine remarks; *Einleitung in die biblische Geschichte*, 1770 ff. (new edition, Stuttgart, 1876), in a plain popular form, and likewise offering a wealth of subtle thought; *Exposition of the Prophecies of Daniel*, and others. The chief work of Burk and Hiller are cited by Delitzsch, *l.c.* p. 10. Compare also the introduction to Auberlen's book, *Die Theosophie Friedr. Christ. Oetingers.*

(5) On Crusius compare Delitzsch (*l.c.* p. 1 ff.), who gives his views in detail, but values him too highly.

(6) In this connection, the argument advanced by Warburton in his work, *The*

* These works are translated in Clark's Foreign Theological Library.

Divine Legation of Moses, is best known. Morgan had urged against the divine origin of the Mosaic religion, the want of faith in immortality and retribution after death; Warburton argued, on the contrary, that just because, under a common providence, civil government cannot be maintained without the belief in future rewards and punishments, the Jewish state must have been ruled by a special providence, because in the Mosaic religion this faith was wanting.—Samuel Shuckford is a quite similar instance. The Deists had declared the Mosaic service of offerings to be unreasonable; now Shuckford argued that, because the worship of God by offerings could not have been arrived at by mere reason (for "I cannot see upon what thread or train of thinking they could possibly be led to make atonement for their sins, or acknowledgments for the divine favors, by the oblations or expiations of any sorts of sacrifice: it is much more reasonable to think that God Himself appointed this worship"), the Lord God must Himself have set up this service (*The Sacred and Profane History of the World Connected*, 1808, i. p. 34, comp. p. 79; the first ed. appeared in 1727).—The chief work (in German) on the history of English Deism is by Lechler, 1847; [in English by Leland, *View of Deistical Writers:* see also Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought*, 1863.]

(7) Spencer's view on the Mosaic ritual law is expressed completely and concisely in his *Dissertatio de Urim*, sec. xii. (ed. Pfaff, p. 974), in the following sentences: "Verisimile est rituum Mosaicorum partem multo maximam ex hoc triplici fonte manasse: (1) e moribus quibusdam religiosis, quibus patriarcharum exempla et antiquitatis supremæ canities reverentiam conciliarant.—(2) Quidam ritus et leges Mosaicæ e malis sæculi moribus, ut bonæ leges solent, nascebantur. Cum enim Israelitarum mores post curvitatem diuturnam in Ægypto contractam ad rectum duci, nisi in contrarium flectendo, non potuerint; leges ritusque multos cum moribus olim receptis e diametro pugnantes instituit Deus.—(3) Alii originem petiere e consuetudine aliqua, quæ apud Ægyptios et alios e vicino populos inveteravit; quam Deus integram pæne reservavit Israelitis, ut eorum animos sibi conciliaret, qui gentium moribus assueverant, et iis ingenia sua penitus immiscuissent."—What is characteristic of Spencer's conception of Mosaism lies principally in what is said in number 3. The subtilty which the age was fond of ascribing to founders of religions is transferred to God Himself. (To this Witsius has replied well, in his *Ægyptiaca*, Amst. 1683, lib. iii. cap. xiv., directed against Marsham's *Canon Chronicus*, and Spencer's *Diss. de Urim et Thummim*). "God appears as a Jesuit, who makes use of bad means for reaching a good aim" (Bähr).

(8) Hengstenberg has given a thorough critique of the three last named works in his *Genuineness of the Pentateuch* i. pp. 3–17. (9) On Semler, compare Diestel's essay in the *Jahrb. für Deutsche Theol.* 1867, p. 471 ff., "Zur Würdigung Semlers." Semler's merits lie more in the department of the history of doctrine, not so much in the Old Testament.

§ 13.

RISE OF A BIBLICAL THEOLOGY DISTINCT FROM DOGMATIC. TREATMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT BY RATIONALISM, AND BY THE NEWER HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION (1).

John Philip Gabler in his academic oration, *De justo discrimine theologiæ biblicæ et dogmaticæ*, 1787, is regarded as the first who distinctly spoke of Biblical Theology as an historical science. The name, indeed, is older, but was used to denote sometimes a collection of proof-texts for dogmatic theology, sometimes a popular system of doctrine and ethics, sometimes a systematic statement of biblical doctrine independent of the dogmatic theology of the Church, and designed to serve in criticising the latter. The most important book of the last-named

class is Zachariae's *Biblical Theology*, 4 parts, 1772–75 (2).—Gabler, on the other hand, defined the work of Biblical Theology as the statement of "the religious ideas of Scripture as an *historical fact*, so as to distinguish the different times and subjects, and so also the different stages in the development of these ideas."—This necessarily demanded the separation of Old and New Testament theology. A separate discussion of each was next given by Lorenz Bauer, Professor of the Doctrine of Reason and of Oriental Languages at Altorf (*Theology of the Old Testament*, 1796; Appendices to the work, 1801) (3). But the interest in the historical treatment of the subject was not accompanied by an equal endeavor to penetrate into the contents of the Old Testament. The "vulgar rationalism" of the period of which Bauer is a representative, was neither stimulated, by the suggestions of Lessing (4) and Kant (5), to grasp the educational character of the Old Testament, nor did it learn from Herder to appreciate its literary beauty. The chief aim was to eliminate everything which could be called temporary, such as form, orientalism and so forth, and thus to dilute the essential contents of the Bible and reduce them to a few very ordinary commonplaces. The superficiality of this process is in great measure shared by the unfinished work of Gramberg, *Critical History of the Religious Ideas of the Old Testament*, 1829–30. Baumgarten Crusius's *Outlines of Biblical Theology*, 1828 (which gives up the separation of Old and New Testament theology), and Daniel v. Coelln's *Biblical Theology* (1836, 2 vols.), are the first works that mark the transition to a thorough treatment of our subject. The hints respecting a treatment of the Old Testament as an organic history, which had been offered by Herder (6) mainly under stimulus from Hamann, were taken up by De Wette with discriminating appreciation. But in his *Christ. Dogmatik*, which is controlled by the philosophy of Fries (3d ed. 1831), this view is not carried through (7). Of recent theologians, Umbreit has most fully accepted the standpoint of Herder, developing it in a positive direction (*Practical Commentary on the Old Testament Prophets*, 1841 ff.; *Sin, a contribution to Old Testament Theology*, 1853; *The Epistle to the Romans expounded on the basis of the Old Testament*, 1856). Ewald, in his *History of the People of Israel* (four vols. of the seven belong to the Old Testament, 3d ed. 1864 ff., and with these goes the volume on the *Antiquities of Israel*, 3d ed. 1876), has interwoven with his narrative a full account of the growth of the Old Testament religion, but his vague notion of revelation does not raise him essentially above the rationalistic method which he despises; yet this diffusely written work contains, along with much that is arbitrary, much also that is excellent and suggestive.

The new phase into which the study of the *history of religion* has entered in the present century, mainly through the influence of Creuzer, has exerted a considerable influence on the treatment of the Old Testament. The attempts to throw light on the traditions of Genesis and the institutions of Moses, from the comparative history of religion, have especially been numerous; cf. Buttmann's *Mythologus*, and several essays of Baur in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* (8). Kaiser in his *Biblical Theology* (1813, 2 vols.), proposed to treat the whole biblical religion "in accordance with a free theological position, giving it its place in critico-comparative general history and in universal religion." But the comparative method is applied so wholly out of measure and rule, especially in the first volume, that the author himself subsequently passed sentence upon his

own book. The chief defect in this comparison of religions was a too great dependence on outward resemblances without a sufficiently deep perception of the specific peculiarities of the religions compared. The characteristic idea of each religion was taken mainly from Schleiermacher and Hegel, both of whom had failed to do justice to the specific connection of the Old and New Testaments; while Schelling's philosophy of revelation, on the other hand, does recognize the specific relation of the Old Covenant to Christianity, in spite of the fact that the philosopher regards the basis and immediate presuppositions of the Old Testament as identical with those of heathenism, and represents the religion of the Old Covenant not as exempt from the mythological process, but as working through it (9). The Old Testament was viewed from the standpoint of Hegel, by Rust (*Philosophy and Christianity*, 2d ed. 1833), Vatke (*Religion of the Old Testament*, 1835; only the first part was published: in point of form the work is very finished), and Bruno Bauer (*Religion of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. 1838); but from the same philosophical standpoint the two last named came to entirely opposite results (10).

(1) Specially valuable for the history of Biblical Theology, since the end of last century, is the above-cited essay of Schmid, "on the value and position of the Biblical Theology of the New Testament in our time," *Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol.* 1838, p. 125 ff.

(2) Zachariae discusses the doctrines of the Old Testament at length, but they are seldom treated in a purely historical manner (*e.g.*, § 81, etc.).

(3) Lorenz Bauer wrote on [nearly] all the departments of Old Testament study (not only on biblical theology, but on—*Hermeneutica sacra V. T.*, *Introduction to the Old Testament Antiquities, and History of the Hebrew Nation*), and wrote commentaries on some of the Old Testament books. The applause with which these writings of a theologian who made the Old Testament "readable" were greeted, appears from the reviews in the theological journal of Ammon and Haenlein (afterward of Gabler). He may be viewed, therefore, as a leading representative of the rationalistic treatment of the Old Testament at that period. The historical process by which he gets at the successive development of religion is to distinguish the doctrine (1) of Genesis, (2) of the other books of the Pentateuch, (3) of the book of Joshua, (4) of Judges, and so on—fourteen divisions in all. This is enough to show how external is his apprehension of the historic development. The critical treatment consists in judging the contents of the Old Testament from the principles of the most commonplace intelligence, and sometimes in condemning them as superstitious or immoral; or at times "the weaker philosophy of the Hebrews" is treated with more indulgence, or we are told that this was "the extent of the religious enlightenment of the Hebrews." [Prol.]

(4) In his work on *The Education of the Human Race.*

(5) Kant's work, *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason*, which is regarded as the starting-point of the modern philosophy of religion, takes notice, though but briefly, of the Old Testament. Kant asserted the relative necessity of a positive religion. The absolute demand of the moral law that the radical evil *must* be overcome by what is good, can be accomplished in mankind as a whole only by the founding of an ethical community in which the moral law becomes the general principle. But such an ethical society can be founded only by a *religion* which, in order to the visible manifestation of the ethical commonwealth, must take *statutory shape*, since men always desire a confirmation through the senses of the truths taught by reason. But a statutory law must be prescribed under divine authority: it is the vehicle of the religion of reason by which man must train himself to free morality.—One would suppose that these propositions opened the way in an unexpected manner for the philosophic apprehension of Mosaism; but

Kant made no such application of them. He had a strong antipathy to the Old Testament, under the idea that the law of Moses contains not moral, but mere political precepts—does not prescribe moral disposition as a motive; and that the Old Testament has no doctrine of immortality, and is confined to a single nation. [Prol.]

(6) Special reference is due to Herder's *Letters on the Study of Theology*; cf. *e.g.* the 18th letter in vol. ix. of his religious and theological works. The leading proposition which Herder there states is: "The whole Old Testament rests on an ever fuller development of certain primitive promises, images, results, and their whole combined *sense*—their ever wider and more spiritual *purpose*: the New Testament was therefore a fulfilling of the Old, as the kernel appears when all the shells and husks that hid it are stripped off. They were stripped off gradually, and with ever increasing delicacy, *till Christ appeared*; and they shall yet be universally recognized as having one divine end, when He shall come with His kingdom."

(7) Of De Wette's writings we have here specially to mention two ingenious essays,—his "Contribution to the Characteristic Features of Hebraism," in Creuzer and Daub's *Studien*; and a paper on "The Symbolico-typical kind of teaching in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in the theological *Zeitschrift*, edited by him in association with Schleiermacher and Lücke. Here we find such statements as the following: "As every phenomenon in time is interwoven with the time that precedes and follows, so Christianity proceeded from Judaism.—The whole Old Testament is one great prophecy, one great type of that which was to come, and is to come," etc. But in De Wette's *Biblical Dogmatics* this view recurs only in general statements (particularly § 211). In the anthropological introduction to this book, the idea of religion is determined according to the philosophy of Fries. This idea is then applied to the religious contents of the Old and New Testaments. Everything in them which does not square with the utterances and laws of the ideal rational faith, and of religious sentiment, is excluded or regarded as clad in a foreign garb, and only what remains is accepted as belonging to the true essence of religion (§ 50, 51). In this process, the Old and the New Testament are to be carefully distinguished, but also to be compared with each other (§ 58).—It appears from his essay on "the exposition of the Psalms for edification" (Basle, 1836), that De Wette regarded the development of the views expressed in these essays as belonging not to scientific theology, but to the practical treatment of the Old Testament for ends of edification. [Prol.]

(8) To this head belong especially Baur's essays "on the original meaning of the Passover and Circumcision," and "the Hebrew Sabbath and the national festivals of the Mosaic cultus"—both in the *Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol.* 1832. In the former essay Baur states the standpoint of his investigation thus: "Mosaism must be viewed as a great religious reform; the renewal and restoration of a purer religion periodically darkened and threatened by still greater darkness and decay. It contains many elements accepted by tradition from primeval antiquity; and the further these elements lie beyond the strictly limited sphere of Mosaism, the more clearly do they point back to a freer and wider region of religion, in which the later polytheism also shares—to a common primeval religion, from which special forms of religion proceeded and subsequently separated." [Prol.]

(9) On Schleiermacher, cf. § 8, note 3; on Schelling, cf. Adolf Planck, *Schelling's Posthumous Works, and their Importance for Theology and Philosophy*. 1858.

(10) Hegel, who it is well known distinguishes religion into three stages, the religion of nature, the religion of the spiritual individuality and the absolute religion, makes the Jewish religion, together with the Greek and Roman, the second stage. An organic relation of Judaism to Christianity is consequently recognized; for the pre-Christian forms of religion are only the individual parts of religion, which in its totality appears in the absolute religion, Christianity. Judaism, like the other religions before Christ, is an essential presupposition of Christianity, for which the Old Testament really contains a preparation. But

Judaism thereby stands in no specific connection with Christianity, at least in none closer than the Greek and Roman religions, which in one aspect appear to be superior to it.—Bruno Bauer, indeed (*Zeitschrift für Speculative Theol.* i. p. 256) endeavored from the standpoint of the Hegelian philosophy of religion, to point out a closer positive connection between Judaism and Christianity; but this standpoint has not carried him beyond the view that the Old Testament religion stands in such a relation to the Greek and Roman religions that each is a negation of the one-sidedness and narrowness of the other, and from this internal process Christianity came into being. Vatke thinks, though scarcely in the sense of his master (Hegel), that no parallel at all can be drawn between the Jewish and the Roman religions, but still holds fast to the view that Christianity stands in the same relation to the Jewish and the heathen religions. On the other hand, we must confess that Stuhr takes a more correct view of the peculiarities of Judaism, although there are valid objections to his psychological arrangement of the steps of religion, according to which heathenism is regarded as the religion of feeling, or of immediate cognition; Judaism, of understanding and reflection, and Christianity, of reason. [Prol.]

§ 14*a*.

THEOLOGICAL VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE EARLIER SUPERNATURALISM, AND IN THE MOST RECENT LITERATURE.

For a long time, *supernaturalism* did comparatively little for Old Testament theology. In only a few treatises is a living historical view of revelation to be found, as in the work of *Hess*, who aims chiefly to show that revelation proceeds on a *plan* (1). More important is *Menken* (*Attempt at a Guide to Self-instruction in the Holy Scripture*, 3d ed. 1833—a kind of biblical dogmatics), who in part carries forward the line of thought found in Bengel (2). In general, the theological use of the Old Testament by the so-called *rational supernaturalists* was confined partly to the proof of the general doctrines of the Christian religion from passages of the Old Testament, partly to the use of the Old Testament prophecies for the defence of revelation. In the latter respect, the chief point treated of was the citations in the New Testament, which, however, were defended often without fixed principles as to the relation of prophecy and fulfilment (3). Of the writers of this school Steudel alone has given a complete exhibition of Old Testament Theology (4). Although he acknowledges the necessity of studying the Old Testament word in its internal connection with the history of salvation, his book is confined to a systematic statement of the religious teachings of the Old Testament; and the progress of religious knowledge in the Old Testament is exhibited not as an organic development, but more from the outside as the gradual filling up of a *framework* given from the first (5).

The first to exert a decisive influence on the theological treatment of the Old Testament was Hengstenberg, mainly by his *Christology of the Old Testament* (3 vols., 1st ed. 1829–35, 2d ed. rewritten, 1854–57); [Eng. transl. 4 vols.]. With all its one-sidedness, or even partly because of its marked one-sidedness, this book made an epoch. The position which Hengstenberg first took in treating the Old Testament, and which he never except partially relinquished, is essentially that of the old Protestant theology; for while not accepting all the tenets of the latter, he yet very distinctly aimed at finding all the fundamental New Testament

doctrines in the Old Testament, not in a process of growth, but ready made (6). With this was naturally united a spiritualizing tendency in his explanation of the prophecies, which failed to do full justice to the historical facts (7). Hengstenberg deserves the credit, however, of having been the first to revive in Germany a strong religious and theological interest in the Old Testament. After his death appeared the *History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament*, edited from his lectures, 1869–71 [Eng. transl. 2 vols. 1871–2]. The standpoint of Hengstenberg's criticism is also that of F. R. Hasse in his *History of the Old Covenant* (published posthumously, Leipzig 1863), a book full of matter, but which does not go into details as to the Old Testament doctrine. In this respect Hävernick's *Lectures on Old Testament Theology* serve as a supplement to the book. These lectures (posthumously published by Hahn, 1848, and again, with notes and valuable additions by H. Schultz, in 1863) state only the doctrines of the Old Testament, and these not completely, but contain much that is very good.

It still remained to exhibit the whole course of the Old Testament history of salvation in its organic continuity, and with due regard to the progressive mutual relation between the word of revelation and the events of history. This task was undertaken by J. Chr. K. Hofmann, *Prophecy and Fulfilment in the Old and New Testaments*, 2 vols. 1841–44. In opposition to Hengstenberg's refusal to recognize the historical gradation in the Old Testament, Hofmann brings to view the progressive connection of prophecy with history ; but in doing so, gives in a one-sided manner the revealing word such a secondary relation to the revealing events, as often to throw the former into the background. The relation between the word and the events of revelation was afterward presented more correctly in Hofmann's *Schriftbeweis*, which contains a series of very valuable contributions to the theology of the Old Testament (8).

(1) The chief production of Hess here to be noticed is, " *On the Kingdom of God ;* an Attempt to sketch the Plan of the Divine Institutions and Revelations," 2 vols. 1781. A subsequent abridgment of the book is entitled *Substance of the Doctrine of the Kingdom of God*, 1814 ; well characterized by Hengstenberg in his *History of the Kingdom of God*, i. p. 85 f.

(2) Menken published the results of his biblical inquiries not in a form strictly scientific, but in a somewhat elevated popular style. He may be said to have regarded it as his life-work to investigate and elucidate the course of revelation ; for in the demonstration of the way in which the history of God's kingdom forms a close harmonious whole, he correctly saw the best defence of the Bible. By his expositions, at once clear and deep, he alike opposed mystical fantasies and rationalistic and supernaturalistic superficiality. No doubt he was himself one-sided, and in particular was led away by his opposition to the Church doctrine of the atonement to an extremely forced explanation of several passages (compare especially in his *Attempt*, etc., chap. vi., Appendix B, on the doctrine of the Atonement, and C, on Isa. liii. 5); but it is not to be forgotten that Menken's view of God's holiness, and its connection with his theory of the atonement, contained an element of truth neglected in the theories he opposed. So, too, we may find reason to object in important points to the essays (bearing specially on Old Testament theology) *upon the brazen serpent* (Bremen, 1829), and on *faith and the doctrine of eternal life in the Old Testament* (Appendix to chap. v. of the *Attempt*) ; but we cannot deny to these investigations, as a whole, the praise of being thorough and carefully considered. [Prol.]

(3) The text of the Old Testament was expounded now literally, now figuratively, just as the citation seemed to demand ; a tortuous process, of which

Schleiermacher might well say, "The effort to prove Christ in this manner from the prophecies I can never regard as a work to be delighted in" (2d letter to Lücke, in vol. ii. of his collected theological works, p. 620).

(4) *Lectures on Old Testament Theology*, delivered by Steudel, edited after his death by me, Berlin 1840 (cf. my notice of the book in Tholuck's *Litt. Anzeiger*, 1843). In further illustration of the views in this work are several monographs by Steudel, among which the most valuable are the essays against the views of Hegel and Rust as to Judaism: "Glances at the Old Testament Revelation," in the *Tüb. Zeitschrift für Theol.* 1835.

(5) A passage, specially characteristic of Steudel's position, is found, *l.c.* p. 66: "In the beginning the consciousness of God, and of man's relation to Him, presents itself in the most general way. We cannot expect here to find man otherwise than with a limited vision, as the child has a limited vision: but the framework, as it were, is already there, and ever as the vision grows more extended, religious knowledge becomes richer." To the same purport it is urged, p. 67, that from "the sum of divinely revealed truth" must be *stripped off* what is imperfect in the form, which is a consequence only of the imperfection of the nursling, not of the nurturer.—Although the principle of a divine tuition here set forth is perfectly legitimate, every one can see that the feature by which the law was [illegible] has not justice done to it. But even apart from this, the whole idea that in the New Testament the cognitions of truth contained in the Old are only, as it were, stripped of certain imperfect forms, and on the other side increased by further knowledge, is utterly untenable. Such an idea ascribes to the Old Testament both too much and too little. *Too much*, for we are bold to assert that there is not one biblical doctrine which is fully unfolded in the Old Testament, and therefore transferred to the New Testament without further development, as a complete thing by itself: and *too little*, since the New Testament gives no wholly new doctrine; but, on the contrary, the truth of the gospel has a corresponding preparation in the Old Testament in all its compass and all its parts. Compare also my article "*Steudel*," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*

(6) This was demanded of Hengstenberg by his strong faith in revelation, which repudiated every concession made to rationalism, and by the common-sense character of the man, which in all things pressed for firm final results. This characteristic comes out most strongly in the first volume of the first edition of his *Christology*; especially in the sections on "The Godhead of the Messiah in the Old Testament," and "The Suffering Messiah in the Old Testament." In the former essay, the whole doctrine of the God-manhood of the Messiah and the inner distinctions of the divine essence (the difference between the revealed and hidden God) is transferred to the Old Testament. The difference between the Old and New Testaments on this point (*l.c.* p. 250) is supposed to be only that the latter doctrine is less prominent in the Old Testament, because before the Logos became flesh, the Revealer, and He whom He revealed, were, as it were, lost in one another.—But the true view is, that till the Logos became flesh, the real incarnation of God and therefore also the inner distinction in the divine essence could not be revealed at all; for the *acts* of God and His *testimony* are not outside of but in each other, mutually conditioning each other. The Old Testament reaches, on the one hand, to the temporary descent of God into visibility in the Angel of the Lord; on the other side, it struggles after the apprehension of the Messiah in a divine fulness of life and divine dignity. But the Angel of the Lord always returns into the divine essence; and though the Spirit of Jehovah rests on the Messiah, Jehovah Himself remains transcendent to Him. The real union of God and man is therefore aimed at in the Old Testament; but the Old Testament contains only the *movement* toward this union, and therefore does not contain an anticipation of the knowledge of it. (See my review of Hävernick's critical investigations on Daniel, in Tholuck's *Lit. Anzeiger* for 1842). In other words, in respect to this doctrine, Hengstenberg understands the unity of the two Testaments to mean, that the New Testament doctrine is found in the Old Testament as a complete, finished prophecy, though perhaps

"less prominent;" but the true meaning is rather that the New Testament *is growing* in the Old, and therefore *is* in the Old only in the sense in which the higher developments of every organism are contained in germ and type in its lower stages. [Prof. J.—In later years, Hengstenberg partly drew back from this standpoint; compare also what is said by him in the introduction to his *History of the Kingdom of God*, etc., i. p. 19, in answer to these objections.

(7 and 8) Compare my article "Weissagung" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopædie*, xvii. p. 650 ff. Of recent books, the following may be mentioned: Samuel Lutz, *Biblical Dogmatics*, posthumously edited by Rudolf Ruetschi, with a preface by Prof. Dr. Schneckenburger, Pforzheim, 1847, especially in the second part; "Historico-dogmatical Discussion of the Biblical Statement of the Divine Dispensation of Grace in Israel," Ed. Nägelsbach, *The God-man, the Fundamental Idea of Revelation in its Unity and Historic Development*, vol. i.; *The Man of Nature*, 1853, unfortunately carried no further than Noah. Important contributions to our subject are found in Kurtz, * *History of the Old Covenant*, 2 vols., 2d ed. 1853–58; Auberlen, * *Divine Revelation*, an apologetical Essay, 2 vols. 1864; Delitzsch, * *System of Biblical Psychology*, 2d ed. 1862. Hupfeld's *Commentary on the Psalms* contains notes valuable for the understanding of the Old Testament. Numerous monographs will be referred to in the course of the book.

§ 14b.

CONTINUATION: THE MOST RECENT LITERATURE.

[Of the learned works in this department recently issued, one of the most important is the *Old Testament Theology* of H. Schultz, 2 vols. 1869, a second edition of which appeared in one vol. in 1878. The religion of the Old Testament is regarded as the religion of revelation in its gradual progress, the religion of redemption coming into being, in distinction from redemption completed, as it is in Christianity. The special revelation which lies at the basis of both the Old and the New Testament religion is recognized as corresponding to the special connection of the two. Hence, while it is strongly affirmed on the one hand that the Old Testament religion is historically conditioned and prepared by the general prior development of mankind, and especially by the religious development of the Semites, and also that it follows historical laws in its further advance, the firm position on the other hand is taken, that its origin and development are by no means to be explained as barely proceeding from historical relations, but from revelation in the special historical sense of the word. Still it must be confessed that Schultz's idea of revelation is burdened by an unbiblical restriction (cf. § 6, note 2).

H. Ewald, in his comprehensive work, *The Doctrine of the Bible concerning God, or Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, 4 vols., Leipsic, 1871–76, believing with the Christian Church in all ages, "that the books of the two Testaments as Holy Scripture constitute an inseparable unity in respect to their contents and aim," but keeping in view also the difference both between the two Testaments and the individual books, exhibits the unity of doctrine in the Old and the New Testaments. He regards revelation, on which all religion, and especially the religion of the Bible rests, as the illumination of the human spirit, in its search after God, with new religious thoughts and intuitions. On this view revelation is rather an

* These works are translated in Clark's Foreign Theological Library.

achievement of the human mind than a thing received. It looks more like a psychological phenomenon than as an act of God. F. Hitzig, in his posthumous *Lectures on Biblical Theology and Messianic Prophecy in the Old Testament*, Karlsruhe, 1880, holds, in distinction from this, that there is no need of a special revelation. He conceives the God of Israel to be the product of human reflection resting upon the basis of a religion held by Arab nomads, and the religion of Israel as the creation of the Hebrew mind, "constituted from the beginning for the true religion."

What is usually styled the Graf hypothesis, according to which the priestly legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch is a post-exilic production, belonging to the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, would, if it were proved to be correct, be followed by sweeping results, because it would entirely revolutionize the received view of the historical progress of the religion of Israel. This hypothesis, advanced or suggested by Vatke and Reuss, was further elaborated by Graf in his work, *The Historical Books of the Old Testament* (Leipsic, 1866); and more recently J. Wellhausen's *History of Israel*, vol. i. (Berlin, 1878), has won many adherents to the view that "the Mosaic law is not the point of departure for the history of ancient Israel, but for the history of Judaism—that is, of the sect which survived the people annihilated by the Assyrians and Chaldeans." The latest work in which the attempt is made to carry out this view is the *History of the Sacred Writings of the Old Testament*, by E. Reuss, Brunswick, 1881–82. In adopting this hypothesis, Bernhard Duhm, in his *Theology of the Prophets as the Foundation for the Internal History of the Development of the Israelitish Religion* (Bonn, 1875), undertook, by an investigation of the contents of the prophetical books, to get a view of the origin of prophecy without the basis of the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch (1). The important contributions recently made to the history of religion, especially by Egyptology and Assyriology, promise to become fruitful for the understanding of the Old Testament. The *Studies for the History of Semitic Religions*, by W. W. Grafen Baudissen (vols. i. and ii., Leipsic, 1876–78), come in this connection into consideration.]

(1) On account of the importance attached at present to the question of the origin of the priestly legislation, the following works may be mentioned: In favor of the hypothesis, A. Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, Haarlem, 1869, Eng. transl. 3 vols. 1875); *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, Leyden, 1875, Eng. transl. 1877); Kayser, *The Post-exilic Book of the Original History*, 1874, also "The Present State of the Pentateuch Question," in the *Jahrbücher für prot. Theologie*, 1881, Nos. 2, 3, 4 (the first article is on the history of the hypothesis); Wellhausen, "On the Composition of the Hexateuch," *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, 1876–77. Kittel, "The most Recent Phase of the Pentateuch Question," in the *Theol. Studien aus Würtemberg*, 1881, Nos. 1, 2, takes an intermediate position. Against the hypothesis: Delitzsch, in a series of articles in *Luthardt's Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, 1880, and later Bredenkamp, *Gesetz und Prophet*, Erlangen, 1881; to be consulted also, Dillmann's *Commentar zu Exodus u. Leviticus*, who, after a thorough study of the Levitical legislation, while admitting that the book of the law did not receive its final form and order until the time of Ezra and after the exile, sharply says, "that the laws concerning the priests and public worship were first committed to writing, or still further, were actually first made in the exile and in Babylon, where no public worship was held, is nonsense. There is no evidence whatever that the Elohistic part of the Pentateuch was written in the age after the exile; the testimony of Ezekiel is

against it; many laws of this part of Pentateuch are against it; the usages of the post-exilic period are against it." See also Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, 1883, and Prof. Briggs's Art. in the *Presbyterian Review*, 1883].

IV.—METHOD OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.—DIVISION OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

§ 15.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HISTORICO-GENETIC METHOD.

According to the definition in § 2, the method of Biblical Theology is *historico-genetic*. As a historical science, it rests on the results of *grammatico-historical exegesis*, the business of which is to reproduce the contents of the biblical books according to the rules of language, with due regard to the historical circumstances under which the books originated, and the individual relations of the sacred writers. In the last respect the grammatico-historical exegesis passes over into psychological exposition, which goes back to the inner state of the writer's life—a species of exposition which, of course, is peculiarly indispensable in dealing with passages which, like the Psalms, the book of Job, and so forth, give immediate expression to inner experiences and frames of mind. But in this psychological exposition we reach a point where success is necessarily proportional to the measure in which the Spirit, which rules in the sacred writers, witnesses of Himself to the interpreter, enabling him to understand by personal experience the inner experiences of the writers.—If exegesis, however, goes no farther than the exposition of individual passages, it gives only an imperfect preparation for Biblical Theology. Not the least important cause of the former defective condition of the latter was the fact that expositors limited themselves mainly to the explanation of isolated passages, which, thus isolated, might easily be made to favor any preconceived opinion. Exegesis, therefore, must proceed to grasp the sense of individual passages, first in its internal connection with the fundamental idea of the book in general, and with the system of thought characteristic of the author, and then in its wider connection with the circle of ideas proper to the special region of the dispensation of revelation to which the book belongs—a process which Schleiermacher in his *Hermeneutik* reckons as part of psychological exegesis. In this way, we reach the various forms in which revelation expresses its contents. But now *Biblical Theology*, which proposes to set forth revelation in its whole course and in the totality of its phenomena, must comprehend these forms as *members of an organic process of development*. And since every such process can be comprehended only from the points of its culmination, Biblical Theology must view the Old Testament in the light of the completed revelation of God in Christ for which it formed the preparation,—must show how God's saving purpose, fulfilled in Christ, moved through the preliminary stages of this history of revelation. While the external historical method deals with the contents of the Old Testament according to the presumed chronological order of the books,

and then at most shows how new religious knowledge was added from time to time to what was already in existence—how the earlier knowledge was completed, deepened, corrected ; while the dogmatist forces the doctrinal contents of the Old Testament into a framework brought to it from without ; and while the method of philosophical construction deals in a similar manner with the Old Testament, by cutting it up critically until it can be fitted into a presupposed scheme of logical categories—the *genetic* method seeks to reproduce the living process of the growth of the thing itself. This method refuses, however, to find ripe fruit where only the bud exists ; it aims to show how the fruit grew from the bud ; it sketches the earlier stages in a way that makes it clear how the higher stages could, and necessarily did, spring from the former (1).

(1) De Wette (in his essay *On the Exposition of the Psalms for Edification*, already cited) disputes the scientific objectivity of what we demand of theological exegesis. He says (p. 22) that everything that links the Old Covenant to the New, and forms the element of life in which the Old Testament grows up into the New, to the full realization in Christ of a life at once divine and human, is purely general, indefinite, floating, and cannot form part of theological science, but only of interpretation for edification. That it is of a general kind, is true ; that it is also indefinite, floating in the air, is false. For example, no one will assert that, in the systems of Greek philosophy, the idea in which they are inwardly linked together, and which forms the element of life in which the development of the one moves on to the other, "is in its nature something indefinite and floating," and thus incapable of scientific expression. On the contrary, the scientific treatment of the history of philosophy is bound to find a sharply defined expression for the type which lies at the basis of the development of philosophical systems. Now certainly the philosopher, in proportion to his distance from the culminating point of the development, will be less conscious of the relation of his own system to the development of the philosophical idea. Yet it is no violent procedure, but only what is due to the system, when the historian gives to it its right place in the process of philosophical development, and explains it from this connection.—Something analogous is demanded of Biblical Theology—not to add anything new to the knowledge of the sacred writers, but to grasp what lay in their consciousness, in its connection with the whole organism of revelation and its relation to the completion of revelation, and so historically to comprehend it. This understanding of Old Testament revelation its organs themselves could not possess, at least not in full measure (compare the well-known passages concerning the prophets, 1 Pet. i. 10–12 ; 2 Pet. i. 20), because in every process of development the lower stage does not fully understand itself. But Christian theology stands on the summit, from which it surveys the whole course of the preparation for Christianity ; and it would be strange if Old Testament Theology gave up this advantage. Theological exegesis, in the right sense of the word, is not affected by the fact that Stier (whom De Wette mainly attacks) and other writers have brought theological interpretation into bad repute, by their habit of finding a second, third, and fourth subordinate and secondary sense in the Old Testament besides the historico-grammatical sense. All that ought to be pointed out is the relation (to the completion of the divine kingdom) of the thought yielded by the grammatico-historical exegesis of a passage—the germinant character which gives us words full of futurity ; the Spirit of revelation often speaking by His organs words which, in the fulness of their significance, they themselves did not understand.

§ 16.

DIVISIONS OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY STATED AND JUSTIFIED.

Since the historico-genetic method seeks to reproduce the course of development of the thing itself, the divisions of Old Testament theology must correspond to the stages in which the development of Old Testament religion took place. The *proper division* is given by the following considerations: The basis of the Old Testament religion is the *covenant* with the chosen people, into which God entered for the accomplishment of His saving purpose. This covenant, for which the way is prepared in the first two ages of the world, is carried out in two stages: 1. The patriarchal covenant of promise; and, 2. The Mosaic covenant of the law, on the basis of which the theocracy is founded. This whole sphere may be summed up in the name *Mosaism;* for the *pre-Mosaic* revelation is not only considered in the Pentateuch as forming the introduction to the establishment of the theocracy under Moses, but itself forms a component part of the religious belief of Mosaism (1). Whatever elements of post-Mosaic development of legal institutions may be contained in the Pentateuch, they still rest on the principle of Mosaism; and so, too, the other theological elements contained in the Pentateuch form the presuppositions that lie at the foundation of the prophetic theology.—On the basis of the covenant of the law, the development of the Old Testament religion is carried on in two ways: First, on the side of God, who continues both to execute and to proclaim His purposes, the former by guiding the people toward the purpose of the divine kingdom; the latter, in the testimony of prophecy which accompanies the history of the people and which interprets it at each step in the light of the divine counsel of salvation, and points to the completion of God's kingdom. The second part of Old Testament theology, which we briefly call *Prophetism*, deals with those elements in the history of the people of Israel from their entrance into the promised land which are important for the development of God's kingdom, considering these *as they appear in the light of prophecy*, and also discusses the theology of prophecy itself.—Side by side with this objective development of the Old Testament religion goes a subjective development in the Old Testament *Wisdom*, which equally with prophecy has its root in the law, but develops itself independently of prophecy, and does not, like the latter, claim to be an objective word of God, but expresses itself in aphorisms (מְשָׁלִים) as the result of meditation by [inspired] sages whose intellectual instincts are roused [presided over and guided] by revelation. Nor does it busy itself with the spheres marked out by theocratic institutions and the prophetic word, but directs itself mainly to the contemplation of cosmical ordinances and the general aspects of the ethical life. Thus our third division is the Old Testament *Hhokhma* [wisdom] (2).

(1) Against our definition of Mosaism it has been urged, *e.g.* by Sack, in a review of my Prolegomena (*Monatsschr. für die evang. Kirche der Rheinprovinz*, etc., 1845), that it is quite necessary to treat the sphere of patriarchal revelation as a separate stage, introductory to Mosaism.—It is true that this sphere presents a relative difference from the later Mosaic revelation, as the Pentateuch itself indicates, by the difference in the names of God; and it is possible to treat the

two apart, for Hengstenberg's latest work, cited above, proves that this preliminary stage may be extended to form a theological whole with rich contents. But such a course makes many repetitions inevitable in the part on Mosaism. I think it best myself to incorporate the whole preparatory stage in Mosaism.—K. I. Nitzsch, on the other hand, would make the whole Old Testament theology begin with Abraham. He maintains that there is no necessity of making a separate doctrinal chapter on the patriarchal age. The primeval history in the first eleven chapters of Genesis gains its right place, according to him, by being placed in the didactic section of Mosaism (article *Biblische Theologie*, in Herzog's *R. E.* ii. p. 224).—In general this is sound; Mosaism gives no theory of creation, sin, etc., but presents these doctrines in a historical form. But though thus the contents of these chapters receive full elucidation only in the didactic section of Mosaism, we must follow Genesis in beginning with the creation, if we wish to place the connection of the narrative in the light in which the Old Testament itself unites the history of revelation, beginning with Abraham, to the primeval time.

(2) The *division of the Old Testament canon into Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa*, though not entirely agreeing with the division we adopt, points at least toward it. Mosaism is contained in the Tora; only it is absolutely necessary to treat the book of Joshua as part of the first division of Old Testament theology, though it stands in the second division of the canon. The whole literary character of the book and its fundamental theological teachings are essentially connected with the Pentateuch; though it is, perhaps, questionable whether in its present shape it ought really to be called the sixth book. The two divisions of the נְבִיאִים, the prophetic books of *history* (the former prophets) and the prophetic books of *prophecy* (the latter prophets), correspond in the main with our two divisions of the second part of Old Testament theology, save that we take up in this second part the historical books of the Hagiographa and the book of Daniel. In the כְּתוּבִים, the Psalms and the books of the Hhokhma contain what we call the *subjective* development of the Old Testament religion; though a good part of the Psalms is cognate in subject to the section on prophecy, and is taken up there.

[A reviewer of Oehler in the *Liter. Centralblatt*, 1873, No. 50, objecting to this division, says: "It is a groundless assumption that Mosaism is a sort of root of prophetism and the doctrine of wisdom, or that these are only two radii which proceed from Mosaism." The force of this may be estimated by his other remark: "on the contrary, we already meet in Mosaism prophetic outlooks, and even before Moses, Jacob had uttered, according to the traditional theology, his Hhokhma words, which Moses himself then recapitulated." For aside from the fact that Jacob's words are no Hhokhma words, what he advances is no proof against the position that the development of the Old Testament revelation and religion, on the basis of the Mosaic legal covenant, proceeded in the twofold way presented in the paragraph, and there is no sufficient reason for questioning the propriety of naming the two series of development, prophetism and Hhokhma.

Of more force is the objection of H. Schultz (*Jahrbüch. für deutsche Theologie*, 1874, p. 309), who says, in reviewing this work: "The separate treatment of the so-called Hhokhma appears to me a mistake, since its sources extend over the entire period of the literature of the Old Testament." But on a closer examination this objection proves to be more apparent than real. Since the Hhokhma is treated not as a special stage of development which succeeds prophetism, but as contemporaneous and parallel with it, the real objection of Schultz must lie against making Mosaism a presupposition of the Hhokhma. Now since he does not deny that Moses was the founder of the religion of Israel (comp. his *Alt test. Theologie*, p. 126 ff., 72 ff., 81 ff.), and that consequently Mosaism preceded the development of the Hhokhma, he can only mean that the sources do not place us in a condition to become acquainted with the original Mosaism in its purity, and that we only have it with the further form which it had assumed at about

the end of the ninth century B.C., a form of which the older parts of the Hhokhma constitute a factor. But this last position, without which the objection of Schultz has no force, cannot be accepted. That some parts of the Hhokhma are contemporaneous with further developments of Mosaism in particulars, is no evidence that they belong to the same category. It is possible that their relation to Mosaism is entirely different from that of direct development. If, for example, a man like Samuel prescribed a law for the Israelitish kings in the spirit of Moses and his institutions, this would sustain a relation to Mosaism different from that of the view of evil in the book of Job, which goes beyond the Mosaic doctrine of retribution. The two views presented in Job exhibit different stages of religious thought, while in the former case we have only the application of the same principle or fundamental thought to new relations.—It may be added that even according to the criticism of Schultz there are important sources of information which are evidently older than the Hhokhma. Not merely does he recognize a series of pieces in the Pentateuch which indicate a greater age, but even the document B (the Jehovist) he regards as dating at least as far back as the time of Solomon. This composition would accordingly give us information concerning a "Mosaism" which already had a definite shape at an age when the Hhokhma was beginning to develop. Even if, therefore, the critical results of Schultz were anything more than hypotheses, it could not be shown from them that the position assigned to the Hhokhma was a mistake. In favor of treating of the Hhokhma by itself, not only in general is the time at which the sources were composed decisive, but along with the point of view in respect to the time when the range of thought to be exhibited developed itself, there is the subject matter also to be considered.

When, therefore, the reviewer above referred to remarks: "The division adopted by Oehler is not determined by historical considerations, but merely by the contents of the books, and is anything but right and proper," this "*merely*" is palpably false, not only according to the critical principles of Oehler, but of all critics who do not belong to the extreme school, because Mosaism, whatever view be taken of its extent, historically existed before the Hhokhma; and that a *historical* division must not neglect a distinction in regard to the contents of the books, of the importance recognized by Oehler between the Hhokhma and prophetism, no one who is competent to judge will deny. It comes finally to the question whether this distinction has a historical support. The antipathy of the reviewer and of Schultz against the separate treatment of the Hhokhma is to be accounted for no doubt by the view they take of revelation, which prevents their recognition of this distinction; for the more the objective factor in revelation is thrown into the background in comparison with the subjective and psychological, the more does the distinction based upon the objectivity of the revelation imparted to the prophets lose its significance. That the Hhokhma occupies a sphere of its own was recognized by Vatke, whose point of view was radically different from that of Oehler.] Vatke divides the Old Testament religion into three principal forms: the prophetic, the Levitical or legal and symbolical, and the subsequent form of reflection. He adopts this order because, according to his view, the relation of law and prophecy must be reversed, so that the former shall proceed from the latter and give objective form to what the prophets reached in immediate self-consciousness. But when he decides that a separate treatment of these three forms is not advisable, because the difference between them affects only single points, and no one form presents the whole contents and excludes the others, it must be observed in reply that by the chief points brought forward in the forms of prophetism and the Hhokhma, the contents of the Old Testament idea were opened up on different sides, and thereby what is common to both appears often under quite distinct points of view.

We may recognize the difference on which our division rests, in the Old Testament itself, if we look at the expressions by which it indicates its theological contents. It very definitely distinguishes divine commands and prerogatives, divine ways and leadings in history, divine visions and words of revelation to the

prophets, and lastly utterances which are the fruit of the reflection of sages, and which are never introduced in the form which the prophets were accustomed to use. [A reply to the objections made by the critical theory of Graf and Wellhausen to the plan of this work is not possible without going into details. It will often be shown in the sequel how there appears in prophetism a further development of the religious ideas of Mosaism, and thus the whole of the exhibition of the theology of the Old Testament here given may be regarded as a contribution to the evidence that the Mosaic legislation forms the foundation of the development of religion presented in the Old Testament. The position of Dr. Oehler in regard to the Pentateuch question can therefore only be stated in a compendious form. It is as follows :—

We must start with the testimony of the Pentateuch itself in regard to its origin. It expressly declares that Moses wrote the book of the covenant, Ex. xx.–xxiv., and the laws in Ex. xxxiv. 11–27, and beyond this, not indeed the whole of Deuteronomy in its present form (for באר i. 5 means, not "he engraved" or wrote, but "he explained, expounded"), but in all probability the legislative contents of the main part of the book, which in chapter iv. 4–48 and xxviii. 69 (Eng. version xxix. 1) has a special designation at the beginning and end (as the law or covenant given through Moses to the children of Israel), comp. xxxi. 9, 24, in which passages, by "this law," not the whole Pentateuch, but only the Deuteronomic law is to be understood, as also undoubtedly is the case of the law which was to be written, according to xxvii. 3, 8, upon stones on Mount Ebal. These legislative portions of Deuteronomy agree, in a remarkable manner, with the book of the covenant in Exodus, which purports to have been written by Moses. The list of stations in Numbers xxxiii. was also, according to v. 2, written by Moses, and the passage in Ex. xvii. 14 contains an intimation that the book of the wars of the Jehovah mentioned in Num. xxi. 14, and used in the redaction of the Pentateuch, is to be referred to Moses. Only on the assumption of falsehood can this evidence of Mosaic composition be set aside, and of falsehood all the more marked, since the legislation of the portion in question firmly adheres throughout to the relations existing in the age of Moses, and speaks with the most vivid remembrance of the experiences of the nation, and especially of what they themselves had seen in Egypt.

In addition to the portions which are expressly referred to Moses as their author, other parts may have proceeded from him, although it is not distinctly stated. The legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch is only represented as orally published by Moses, but it must be assumed as extremely probable that it was committed to writing by the priests, though without excluding the possibility of later supplements. The book of the covenant in Exodus and what pertained to it, as well as the Mosaic legislation codified by the priests, was incorporated into the so-called fundamental writing, (A) and this was enlarged by the additions of the Jehovist (B) who elaborated the whole. The anachronisms of the Elohistic fundamental writing oblige us to bring down its composition to the first centuries of the period of the Judges, but not later. (Even Schultz, p. 83, observes that he formerly maintained the high antiquity of this book, and would be still inclined to accept a greater age for the narrative portions of the book in Genesis, were it not for the legal portions, which obliged him to regard it as, at the earliest, a production of the Babylonian epoch of the prophetic period.) Whether the revision by the Jehovist occurred in the time of the Judges, or later in one of the schools of the prophets, or what other relation there was, cannot be determined.

Against the view expressed at present with special positiveness, that on the assumption of the institutions and conditions presented in the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, the state of the people as described in the following books, and especially the book of Judges, is incomprehensible, it may be replied, that the theocratic ordinances could never have originated in the time of the Judges, nor is there a trace of the founding of the theocracy by Samuel or David, while yet David's ordinances of worship presuppose the Levitical ordinances in the Penta-

teuch.—That the institutions of the Mosaic law had fallen out of use for centuries and were reintroduced at a later period, is attested by the Old Testament itself, not only in the books written after the exile (comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 26 ; xxxv. 18 ; xxxvi. 21 ; Neh. viii. 17), but also in 2 K. xxiii. 22, and Jer. xxxiv. 13, from which last passage it is clear that the ordinances in Ex. xxi. and Deut. xv. respecting the manumission of slaves, had fallen into disuse. Such passages show, however, that there was no doubt in respect to the antiquity of the enactments in question, and their divine authority. Moreover, the consciousness of apostasy which pervades the entire history of Israel, and the feeling of guilt which accompanied it, are only explicable on the ground of an anterior positive legislation which the people constantly disobeyed. (Lectures on O. T. Introduction.)

A view of the Mosaic origin of the legislation in Deuteronomy and the middle books of the Pentateuch essentially agreeing with that advanced above, is defended and thoroughly demonstrated, in opposition to the construction of sacred history in the writings of Graf and Wellhausen, in the work of Bredenkamp, referred to in § 14*b*. The contradictions with which the modern construction of the history of Israel is embarrassed, and the exceeding arbitrariness, illogicalness, and false inferences on which it rests are well exposed by the author.]

PART I.—MOSAISM.

FIRST SECTION.

THE HISTORY OF REVELATION FROM THE CREATION TO THE SETTLEMENT OF THE COVENANT PEOPLE IN THE HOLY LAND (1).

§ 17.

DIVISION OF THIS HISTORY.

The Pentateuch plainly distinguishes four periods in the history of revelation—

1. The *primeval age*, with ten patriarchs, closing with the deluge.

2. Beginning with the *world-covenant* in Noah's time; the time of the division of the peoples, by which the separation of the race of revelation is prepared; again with ten generations.

3. The time of the three great patriarchs, beginning with Abraham's election, and the *covenant of promise* made with him; and ending with the sojourn of the chosen people in Egypt.

4. The fourth period opens with the redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage; it includes the giving of the *covenant of the law*, and the establishment of the theocracy, with its regulations (2).

(1) On the literature of the history of the old covenant, see my article, "Volk Gottes," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*, xvii. p. 303 ff., and especially Kurtz, *History of the Old Covenant*, i. § 17 f. [Köhler, *Lehrbuch der bibl. Geschichte des A. T.* § 2.]

(2) These *four periods*, or, as Ewald calls them, the four ages of the world, are so distinctly marked off in the Pentateuch, that there can be no doubt on the matter.—These historical periods in the Pentateuch have been connected by some—as, for instance, by Ewald (*History of the People of Israel*, i. p. 257 f.)—with the four ages of the world, of the Indians, Persians, and Greeks. But this comparison cannot be carried out except in the most arbitrary manner. (Hesiod's doctrine of the generations of mankind—of which, however, he counts not four, but five; four named after metals, with the generation of heroes added to them, as third in order—does not at all rest on the same basis with the Indian doctrine of the four ages of the world; compare Rud. Roth's thorough discussion on the myth of the five generations in Hesiod, and on the four Indian ages of the world, *Tübinger Universitätsprogr.* 1860.) Max Müller also has recently, and with good reason, declared against this combination in his Essays; although

we may still admit that this doctrine of the four ages is very old, especially among the Parsees. The main feature required to make a valid comparison is not found in the Pentateuch—namely, the idea "of a progressive deterioration of the times and of mankind advancing by exactly four steps," which lies at the basis of those views of heathen nations. The nearest resemblance to those heathen notions is the gradual shortening of human life; but in other respects the Pentateuch is far from representing these four ages as periods of steady decay. On the contrary, it pictures the age of the patriarchs as the time of the ancient glory of the people of Israel; and so also the time of Moses as laying the foundation for the whole development of the Old Testament religion.

I. THE PRIMEVAL AGE (1).

§ 18.

THE ACCOUNT OF THE CREATION.

The Old Testament begins with the account of the *creation of the world* (2), which is the result of the Word and Spirit of God. Since God by His *word* calls all things into being, He is placed above the beginning of all time as the eternal and absolutely independent One; since He animates the universe by His *Spirit*, all dualistic separation of God and the world is excluded. On the *earth*, which is the centre of the creation, so that the other spheres are only dealt with in connection with it (Gen. i. 14 ff.), the production of beings advances continually toward higher organisms (3): each step of the creation is relatively complete in itself, and serves in its own way the purpose of God in creation, as is expressed in the oft-recurring word, "And, behold, it was good." Still, the divine creative power is not satisfied till it reaches its ultimate end in the creation of *man*. Not till God has placed His image over against Him, does He rest content from creation. The *creation-Sabbath* stands as a boundary between the creation and the history of the dealings between God and man, and through it we are at the same time pointed to the connection ordained to exist between the order of the world and the order of the theocratic covenant (compare also ver. 14). The paragraph Gen. ii. 4 ff. forms the introduction to the history of man; which paragraph is by no means a second record of creation, but shows, in supplementing the first chapter, how the earth was prepared for a habitation for man —a sphere for his activity, and a place for the revelation of God to man (4).

(1) [A comparison of the early history in the Bible with the cuneiform inscriptions is extremely interesting, both on account of their remarkable resemblance and their characteristic difference. See on this point the work of R. Buddensieg, *Die Assyrischen Ausgrabungen u. das Alte Testament*, 1880. The author endeavors to observe a judicious mean between the uncritical enthusiasm of some and the scepticism of others in regard to these inscriptions. For Old Testament theology *the religious difference* between the biblical and the Babylonian form of the traditions, which originally proceeded from the same source, is of special importance. Says Buddensieg, p. 32 f.: "What a depth of divine thoughts is presented before us on this first page of the Bible! What purity and certainty in its view of God in comparison with the heathen accounts! The picture of creation in the Bible rises before us in gigantic majesty and the most engaging simplicity.

In no other passage, perhaps, does the incomparable pre-eminence of these creative acts of the one Jehovah above the confused and uncertain creative efforts of the Assyrian pantheon so clearly appear. Here is the one God, who unites in himself everything divine which the heathen world divided among its many gods. Here the creation is not a necessitated emanation from his essence, or from wild chaos, but something brought into existence by the free will of the Absolute One. Here is an ascending gradation of acts of creation to the supreme aim. This supreme aim is not, as in the Babylonian account, one or another concurrent cause, not a God, not a new Lord of heaven, but an image of God, "a King of the earth, the synthesis of Spirit and Nature." We have here, on the threshold of the revelation of God to men, a tradition of creation free from mythological additions; here the true idea of God is announced in the midst of a heathenism sunk far and wide in unbelief and apostasy, and in this announcement we have the foundation of all true religions and culture. In the Babylonian account of creation, a multitude of conceptions concerning God and divine things betrays what we may call the childhood of the people; but the creative agency of God, as exhibited in the first chapter of Genesis, is so perfect that the purest knowledge of God is unable to improve upon it in the least."]

(2) The naturalist Cuvier says concerning the first words of Genesis: A sublimer passage than this from the first word to the last never can or will come from a human pen, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."—On the meaning of the introductory chapter of Genesis, without which the whole history of revelation would hang in the air without a beginning, compare the thoughtful remarks of J. G. Staib in a paper in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1852, p. 822 f., "*Die Schöpfungsthat und das Ebenbild, oder Genesis I., II.*" He says: "Whence do these chapters come? I do not know. There they stand, and ever continue to stand, often as it has been attempted to explain them away; and there, doubtless, they will remain until the end of the world, until the conclusion of God's kingdom on earth joins hands with the beginning, and the light of the beginning will again be recognized in the light of the end, and the light of the end in the light of the beginning, that God may be all in all."

(3) We cannot fail to observe a parallel between the first three and the last three days' work. The work of the first and second, the fourth, and fifth days is single; the work of the third and sixth is twofold.

(4) On the disputed question, *how the two sections, Gen.* i. 1–2, 4, *and that immediately following, are related*, note the following: It is the fashion to speak of *two accounts of the creation*, as standing irreconcilably side by side at the opening of Genesis. Admitting that the present shape of Genesis arose by the re-editing of an Elohistic narrative and the addition of Jehovistic passages, it must yet appear most improbable that the author would be so silly as to place at the head of his work two *contradictory* accounts of the creation. The second account, in fact—if such it were—would *omit* some of the most essential points. It presupposes that heaven and earth are created, but as yet no vegetation exists; and then it narrates the creation of man, relates how Paradise was planted, and tells of the animal world. There is wanting in this a multitude of things necessary for a complete account of creation. As to the *point of division* of the two passages, I am convinced that the words, ii. 4*a*, אֵלֶּה תוֹלְדוֹת, etc., belong to what *goes before*, not to what follows. The first section gives a complete and well-rounded account of the creation. Then follows a *supplementary* section, whose aim, as shown above, is not to give another account of creation. A difficulty arises here, simply because it is thought necessary to seek in the second account a stricly *chronological* division. Then, of course, the second section cannot but stand in contradiction to the first. On this view, we should have to conceive the succession of time thus: first, the earth is bare, and nothing grows upon it; then a mist rises; next man is created, by the breathing of the Divine Spirit into the earthly form. Then God leaves the man for a time, and plants a garden, and causes trees to grow up in it; then He fetches the man, and puts him in it. But he must have other creatures about him; so God makes all sorts of beasts and

birds, and brings them to the man ; and it is only when among all these the man finds no companion, that the last step is taken by the creation of woman. Not much reflection, certainly, could be ascribed to a writer who could think this to be the succession of the acts of creation. But the real state of the case is, that in the *second* chapter the arrangement is not in the order of time, but by *similarity of matter*, so that whatever is introduced in elucidation of the progress of the narrative is inserted just where it is required. If we were to press the letter, the question would have to be asked, when it is said that man was placed in Paradise to keep it, Against whom was Paradise to be watched ? It must have been animals or other such like creatures against which the trees had to be protected. To sum up the whole, the relation of the second chapter to the first, in respect to time, is this : it starts from the time which begins *at the end of the second day's work*, and commences here (with the words בְּיוֹם, *in the day*, etc., ver. 4*b*) by treating the question, how the earth, upon which at the close of the second day's work no vegetation had begun, was formed into a dwelling-place for man. But it does not proceed in the same path as the first chapter ; but because the preparation of the earth for *man* is its main point, it begins with this. It might certainly be objected that ver. 8 should have gone on to say : But God had already also caused plants to spring up, and in this vegetable kingdom He now caused all sorts of trees to sprout from the ground, and thus planted Paradise. But who can demand from the author such a detailed statement ? It is the childlike mode of relating, such as we often meet with. Who gives any one a right thus to urge the *Waw consec. cum impf.*, and from it to deduce a chronological contradiction ? The redactor of the Pentateuch, who in so many cases shows his skill in fitting the different sources into each other, would not have placed at the beginning of the Pentateuch such plump contradictions as this would involve.—Comp. also Hölemann, *Neue Bibel-Studien*, 1866, i. (*Die Einheit der beiden Schöpfungsberichte Gen. I. II.*), with the critical views of which I do not agree, but which nevertheless gives much matter that is good.—On the relation of the biblical account of creation to natural science, comp. F. W. Schultz, (*Die Schöpfungsgeschichte nach Naturwissenschaft und Bibel*, 1865). The fuller discussion of the Old Testament idea of creation will be found in the doctrinal section, § 50 f.

§ 19.

THE ORIGIN OF EVIL.

The world as a divine creation is *good* (Gen. i. 31) ; every development of life in it is a divine blessing (i. 22, 28) ; there is no room here for a principle which, in its original nature, is wicked and inimical to God. It is scarcely possible to find in Gen. i. 2 (1) an indication of evil lying beyond the history of man ; but it is otherwise with the description of the serpent in chap. iii. Man is called to be a free being ; therefore a command is given to him for self-decision (ii. 16), in order that he may pass from the condition of innocence to that of *free obedience.* Man falls under the temptation addressed to him from without. Through *sin* the bond of childlike communion with God is broken ; and now man is in a sense independent, like God (iii. 22) ; but fear, resting in the feeling of guilt, dominates from this time forward his position toward God (iii. 8 ff.) (2). The life in Paradise with its peace is forfeited, and man sinks henceforth under the service of perishable things and of death (iii. 17 ff.). Nevertheless conscience, which testifies of guilt, shows also man's *capability of being redeemed ;* and side by side with the curse a divine word points forward (iii. 15) to a victorious end to the conflict, which the descendants of Adam are to wage against the power of evil (3). The

idea placed at the opening of the Old Testament, that as *all evil* which burdens mankind *is the result of sin, the removal of evil can only come by the defeat of the wicked one*, is decisive for the *ethical* character of the Old Testament religion.

(1) In Gen. i. 2 an indication has often been found of a fall of the spirit-world, through which terrestrial creation was ruined; and this is added between the account in vers. 1 and 2. The earth, it is said, as it was originally created by God, could not be תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ; hence the present world must have been preceded by another, which was destroyed by the fall of the world of spirits—a favorite idea of the theosophists. This view cannot be exactly confuted, but no definite indication of any such occurrence lies in תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ. The expression is perfectly suitable, though only a chaotic mass not yet developed is meant.

(2) Genesis gives no theory of creation, no thesis on the essence of *sin*, no theory of its origin; but it sets forth, in the form of a story, a sin from which each can one easily for himself develop the theory, and the thoughts involved in the narrative—thoughts which are decisive for the whole course of revelation. A definition of *religion* is not given; but the way in which it came about that man feels a dread and fear of God, and that his position toward God is dominated in the last instance by the feeling of guilt, is exhibited in a statement of facts. With good reason has K. I. Nitzsch, in his *Academical Lectures on the Doctrine of Christian Faith*, 1858, p. 73, called Genesis the doctrinal theology of the law.

(3) Gen. iii. 15: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed; it shall crush thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (in the second occurrence of שׁוּף an easy zeugma takes place). The *older theology* found in this place, as is well known, the πρῶτον εὐαγγέλιον. The *Roman Catholic* exegesis, according to the reading of the Vulgate received in that Church, refers the words "*ipsa* conteret caput" to Mary. (See especially Bellarmin, *De verbo Dei*, ii. 12. This explanation was, in general, defended by the Jesuits with the greatest zeal; comp. the *Disputatio de protevangelio* in Glass, *Philol. Sacr.* ed. 1743, p. 1395 ff., which is directed against the Jesuit Gordon of Huntley.) The older theology made much of the passage, and glorified it; on the other hand, it is lowered by many of the more recent theologians to the level of trivial truth. It is said to tell nothing, but that men and serpents shall continually make war on each other. [This view is found also in Hitzig, p. 140 ff., who supposes that we have here a myth originally of Persian origin, but not understood by "Hebraism," since on Hebrew ground the symbol had stifled the idea which underlies it. To be sure the genesis of the narrative in the mind of the "Hebrew poet" which Hitzig gives, renders it quite superfluous to derive the story from Parsism. We must be permitted to marvel at the poverty of the Hebrew mind which was able to reach such a shallow thought as Hitzig here finds, only by the aid of a misunderstood Persian myth; and yet we are to believe that this same mind gave birth to the Old Testament as its natural product! Even Baudissen (i. 291 f.) comes to the result that there is no need of bringing in the very different Persian story of Ahriman fallen from heaven in the form of a serpent, in explanation of the serpent in the Garden of Eden. On the other hand it is, according to Buddensieg, p. 34 ff., at least possible that there is some connection with cuneiform tradition.] Such a view overlooks the fact that the words occur in the sentence of punishment against the serpent; it overlooks also the difference between the crushing of the head and the wounding of the heel, and the train of thought in the three divine sentences. The seed of the serpent, which by cunning overcame the woman, shall be vanquished in open combat by the seed of the woman. The woman, who by temptation subjected to herself the will of the man, shall be in subjection to man; but man, who in an unnatural way yielded obedience to the woman, shall in future be master in the household only under the condition of winning from the ground by toilsome labor what serves to support the family. The close of ver. 15 is related to ver. 16 in the way that the close of ver 16 is to ver. 17. As ver. 16 closes with a declaration in favor of

man, which is then turned into a punishment, so in ver. 15 a promise must be found for the woman, but which, according to ver. 16, is accomplished in such a way that the woman receives in it at the same time her punishment.—The older theology certainly erred when it sought to find here the Messiah, the great destroyer of the serpent, directly promised ; but it did not err in the general conception of the thought in the passage. In the simple childlike form, that enmity shall be between man and serpent, the idea is expressed that a struggle shall exist between mankind and the principle of evil, and that man shall carry away from this combat wounds and injuries, while yet the victory cannot be doubtful. Thus, in a few words, the whole course of the development of salvation is here exhibited in its germ ; this is the seed-corn from which the whole history of salvation has grown.

§ 20.

THE FIRST OFFERING. CAINITES AND SETHITES. TRADITION OF THE FLOOD.

The position henceforth taken by the human race toward God is represented in the *first offering*, Gen. iv. (1). Although this is not to be regarded as a proper sin-offering, but rather as a *thank-offering*, by which the offerers acknowledge in presenting it that they look on the gains of their occupation as a gift and blessing from God, the feeling that man must first of all become sure (2) of the divine favor is expressed in these offerings, and consequently a feeling of separation from God, by which the first offering proves to be also an offering of supplication, indeed even an offering of reconciliation, or, in a wider sense of the word, a *propitiatory offering* (3). The reason that Abel's offering pleased God, and Cain's offering displeased Him, cannot be in the fact that the former was a bloody and the latter a bloodless one ; for the difference of the two offerings is distinctly dependent on the difference in their callings. The reason can only be found in the *different states of heart* of the two offerers, which in ver. 3 f. is shown in the fact that Cain offers his gift of the fruit of the ground without selection ; while Abel, on the other hand, brings the *best* of the flock. Thus, in this narrative, the Old Testament testifies at the outset that *offerings when presented as a mere external service* are rejected, *and that only a pious disposition makes the offering well-pleasing to God* (comp. Heb. xi. 4).—In the difference between the two sons of the first human pair, we have the contrast presented henceforth in the history of the human race, and already the separation of a *people of revelation* begins. For while among Cain's descendants, the life of sin rises to insolent defiance (iv. 23 f.) (4), in *Seth*, who takes the place of the murdered Abel, is propagated the race of patriarchs who seek the living God (iv. 26) (5), among whom *Enoch* by his translation testifies of a way of life which raised him above the common lot of death (v. 24), and Lamech at the birth of Noah, before the close of the first period of the world, announces the hope of a Saviour of man from the evil weighing upon him (v. 29) (6).

After the wickedness of man had reached its height by the mixing of the sons of God with the daughters of men, and the time granted for repentance had passed without result, the judgment of extermination was executed in the Flood, from which Noah as the righteous one (vi. 9) was saved, along with his family. The tradition of the flood is found in several religions of antiquity ; but in *these traditions each religion evidently expresses a distinct idea of its own.* For example,

while the flood in the *Indian myth* is only a process of destruction, by which all finite being and life sinks back again into this primitive source in the divine substance, and the man who was saved from the flood represents the inexhaustible spirit of life,—that spirit which overcomes the transient, and calls up a new cycle of life out of the ruin of what existed,—the flood in Genesis, on the other hand, is distinctly related under the *ethical* point of view; it is the *first judgment on the world* executed by the holy God, who, according to Gen. vi. 3, will no longer permit His spirit to be profaned by man's sin. But for Noah and his family the event means that the chosen ones shall be saved because of their *faith* in the word of threatening and promise; see Heb. xi. 7. So the typical application in 1 Pet. iii. 20 f. is also to be explained (8).

(1) Gen. iv. relates that the sons of the first pair offered to Jehovah, as a gift, a portion of the produce of the business of their life: Cain, from the fruits of the ground cultivated by him; Abel, from the firstlings of his flock, and from the fat pieces of these. Abel's gift was received with favor, but Cain's gift with displeasure. To understand the word שָׁעָה, [lit. to *look*, then to *look upon with favor, to have respect to*], with Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1; 2d ed. p. 220), of Jehovah's glance of fire, by which He took to Himself the gift in consuming it, does not agree well with the words, "Jehovah looked upon Abel and his gift," for we surely cannot suppose that Abel himself was struck by the divine gleam of fire. (Art. *Opferkultus des A. T.*)

(2) Cain himself feels this need, and hence his sullen rage on seeing his offering despised.

(3) See my article in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* x. p. 615 f., for a fuller discussion of the meaning of the first offering, and wrong views of it.

(4) The sense of the *song of the sword*, Gen. iv. 23 f., is: I will kill any one who lays hands on me; each injury to my person will I avenge tenfold. [It should be rendered, "For I have slain a man for my wound (*i.e.* for wounding me), and a young man for my bruise.—D.] "In this is uttered," as Delitzsch says (*Commentary on Genesis*, iv. ed. p. 177), "that Titanic haughtiness of which it is said, Hab. i. 11, that his strength is his God, and Job xii. 6, that he carries his God, namely his sword, in his fist."

(5) Gen. iv. 26 is to be rendered: "Then men began to call on the name of Jehovah." Herein is implied that God's name יְהוָה goes back to primeval antiquity.

(6) The passage which refers back to chap. iii. runs thus: "He shall comfort us for our work and the labor of our hands, from the earth, which Jehovah has cursed." The passage manifestly expresses a hope of redemption from the curse weighing on mankind as the consequence of sin. Now, if we may reason backward, it follows that in chap. iii. also there must certainly lie a promise of salvation, although a very indefinite one.

(7) In connection with the passage Gen. vi. 1–4, comp. the didactic section (§ 61, 65, 77), and the good essay of Dettinger: "Remarks on Gen. iv. 1–6, 8, its connection, and some of the more difficult passages in it," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theol.* 1835, p. 3 ff.

(8) With regard to the controversies on the *relation of the Indian legend to the Old Testament*, I agree with those who admit that there are unquestionably points of contact between the Indian myth and the tradition in the Old Testament, but who hold that the tradition, spreading from Central Asia, reached India, and was added at a later date to the Indian doctrine of the ages of the world. [There is much connection between the biblical narrative and that of the cuneiform inscriptions. "The ethical factor in the divine purpose of destruction is not entirely absent, but there are only faint indications that the deluge was regarded as occasioned by sin." The flood also appears again as brought about by the

blameworthy anger of the God *Ilu*. Buddensieg, p. 37 ff. 46.] That the Old Testament meaning of the flood is that stated in the text above is quite clear. If Ewald, in his treatment of the matter, *History of the People of Israel*, i. p. 270, proposes to take as the proper meaning of the flood, that it must have come, "in order to wash clean the sin-stained earth, to sweep away the first race of man, which was utterly degenerated in Titanic intoxication, and to produce on the renewed and cleansed earth a new race made more refined and wiser by the warning," this cannot perhaps be excluded, but it is certainly not that to which Genesis points. At the first glance, we might appeal in favor of Ewald to 1 Pet. iii. 20 f., where the flood is treated as a type of Christian baptism: "In the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water; which now also saves us in the antitype as baptism, not as the putting off of the filth of the flesh, but as the inquiry of a good conscience toward God." However, this interpretation is hardly correct; the passage in Peter rather "contemplates the water of the flood as bearing the ark, and so providing deliverance for Noah and his family" (so Fronmüller in Lange's *Commentary*).

II.—THE SECOND AGE OF THE WORLD.

§ 21.

COVENANT WITH THE WORLD. NOAH'S SAYING. DIVISION OF MANKIND.

The second age of the world begins with the new form taken by revelation, in presenting itself as God's covenant with man, and, in the first instance, as a covenant with the *world*, in which God gives to creation a pledge of its preservation; for the order of nature is the ground on which the order of salvation rises. God's faithfulness in the former is the pledge of His faithfulness in the latter. Isa. liv. 9; Jer. xxxiii. 20 f., 25 f. *Sacrifice*, Gen. viii. 20, precedes the institution of the covenant, and is in the first place an expression of thanks for the deliverance experienced, while at the same time man thereby approaches God, seeking grace in the future (1). The pre-eminence of man even in the state of sin, and his likeness to the divine image, is again declared, ix. 4 ff., on which passage (in connection with others) rests the Jewish doctrine of the *Noachic commandments* which it claims to be a basis for the law before the time of Abraham (2). The type for the development of the human race is indicated in ix. 25–27. The race of Shem, to whom Jehovah is God, is chosen as the bearer of divine revelation; on Japheth the blessing is conferred through Shem; on Ham, and mainly on Canaan, the curse of slavery is to press (3). On the other side, the establishment of that *world-kingdom* which is at enmity with God, proceeds from the Hamites (x. 8 ff.), whose first seat appears to have been Babel. *Here begins the distinction between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world which runs through the whole Bible.* The unity of the race of man is broken up into peoples and tongues; but while in the view of the heathen the diversity of peoples and castes is original, and universal brotherhood is to them a chimera and to a degree an abomination, and on the other hand autochthony is the highest pride of a people, Mosaism, in its *list of the nations* (Gen. x.) preserves the consciousness of

the *blood-relationship of all nations* (comp. Acts xvii. 26), which are again to be united in time to come by one blessing of God (comp. xii. 3, xviii. 18, etc.) (4).

(1) More on Noah's offering in § 121, Note 1.

(2) The *Noachic commandments* have a historical importance, because it was these commandments the fulfilment of which was demanded of the so-called *proselytes of the gate*, while the proselytes of righteousness had to keep the whole ritual law. These seven commandments, however, in their later form are a comparatively recent invention. According to the Babylonian Gemara, they were as follows: 1. The prohibition of idol-worship; 2. Relating to the blessing of the divine name, and the prohibition of desecrating or cursing; 3. The prohibition of bloodshed (Gen. ix. 6); 4. The prohibition of incest, and fornication in general; 5. Forbidding theft and robbery; 6. The command concerning the administration of justice, investing the magistracy with divine authority, and forbidding opposition to it; 7. "Concerning the piece of the living," that is, forbidding the use of blood (Gen. ix. 4). It is well known that the special requirement of the fulfilment of these commands by the heathen who joined themselves to Israel has no Old Testament foundation.

(3) The words of Noah on Gen. ix. 25–27 are of the greatest importance for the conception of the general history of mankind given in the Old Testament: "Cursed be Canaan; let him be a servant of servants to his brothers." "Praised be Jehovah the God of Shem; and let Canaan be his servant." "May Elohim give enlargement to Japheth, and let him (Japheth) dwell in the tents of Shem, and let Canaan be their servant." The old explanation, often repeated even in recent times, which takes אֱלֹהִים as subject to יַפְתְּ, is out of the question. According to our translation, the passage declares that God is to Shem the God of revelation, while He is for Japheth's descendants only אֱלֹהִים, the *numen*, *θεῖον*, the transcendent Divinity, but at the same time (ver. 27*b*) it points to a participation by Japheth in the blessing assigned to Shem: Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem. The ever-recurring explanation, which in ver. 27 makes שֵׁם an appellative is quite untenable. Finally, it is often maintained that the vanquishing of the Shemites by Japheth is here foretold: God enlarges Japheth's territory, so that he obtains dominion over the region assigned to Shem. Even on this view, the passage would be remarkable, for this has indeed come about. But such an exposition of the words does not agree well with the context. I still think it necessary to interpret the words as speaking only of the Japhethites being at home in the tents of Shem, and gaining domestic rights there, which in history has been spiritually fulfilled in the most glorious manner.

(4) In relation to the *list of nations*, note that it is not arranged according to languages; it is more natural to find traces of a geographical arrangement of the three groups of nations in such a way that Shem dwells in the middle, Japheth extends northward, and Ham more to the south. But the point of view is decidedly rather *genealogical*. It is clear that we are not exactly to find individuals in the names given. It often happens, even in the later genealogies, that races and peoples are personified and represented as individuals. What is of value for Old Testament theology in the register of nations is what is brought forward in the text. With this list the book of Genesis takes leave as it were of mankind in general, and revelation henceforth limits itself to a single chosen race. The register of nations is intended to keep in memory the *original brotherhood of all the nations of the earth*. This is a thought beyond the reach of all antiquity, with the exception of Israel. Among the cultivated Greeks it was not till the time of Alexander the Great, and chiefly through Stoicism, that the idea of a common world-citizenship of man found expression; for the antithesis of Greeks and barbarians was invincible. When the Apostle Paul preached on the Areopagus, Acts xvii. 26, "He made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth," he attacked the very heart of heathenism and Athenian pride.

§ 22.

THE FOUNDATION OF A PEOPLE OF GOD.

In order to give an historical basis to the work of salvation, a people is to be chosen as the bearer of revelation, to which coming people (comp. Deut. xxxii. 8), God already has regard in the dividing of the nations (1). The separation of a race of revelation is prepared in Shem's descendants, the line going through Arphaxad, that is (on any explanation of the name) through the Chaldean stem, and further through Eber, a name which certainly had originally a wider meaning [than merely the ancestor of the Hebrews], (comp. Gen. x. 21, xiv. 13), on to Terah (2). Of manifestations of revelation nothing is as yet said ; but a simple monotheism is preserved, which is easily seen to be the oldest foundation even of the religion of the heathen Semites. In connection probably with the mighty moving of the nations at that period the Terahites leave the ancestral dwelling-place of the Chaldeans in Northern Assyria, and wander first to Haran in North Mesopotamia (xi. 31). Here, where (see Josh. xxiv. 2, comp. with Gen. xxxi. 19, xxx. 35) (2) idolatry, designated as the worship of Teraphim, begins to break out even in this family, the basis of the Old Testament dispensation is laid by the calling of Abram (Gen. xii. 1), who closes the second decade of patriarchs. While the nations of the earth walk in their own ways, in which they develop their natural peculiarities, an *everlasting* people is to be founded in Abram's descendants (comp. Isa. xliv. 7), which, in its peculiar national type is to be not a product of natural development, but of the creative power and grace of God (Deut. xxxii. 6), and which forms, agreeably to this, a contrast to the mass of nations of the world (גּוֹיִם, *ἔθνη*), though in such a way that already the obliteration of this contrast is kept in view (comp. § 82). It is only in this *idea of the people of God* that the key is given to the Old Testament history, which would otherwise remain an insoluble riddle. A natural predisposition for the religion of the Old Testament can be recognized in the Semites ; but revelation claims something more than simply to have developed an already existing natural disposition, or only to have filled a natural form with the contents of divine life (3). What belongs to the character of God's people was already prefigured in the history of their forefathers.

(1) Deut. xxxii. 8 : "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the children of men, He set the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the children of Israel." This refers to the division of the nations in Gen. xi. The Rabinnical exegesis makes the passage to mean that, as Israel went down into Egypt in number seventy souls, so also, according to the register of nations, seventy גּוֹיִם are to be counted on the earth. This is certainly not the sense of the passage, but it must be taken as follows : When God assigned to the peoples of the earth the territory where they were to develop themselves, He had in view the place which His chosen people should afterward possess (according to their number) in order to fulfil their historical calling.

(2) With respect to the meaning of the word אוּר כַּשְׂדִּים, it is a question whether it means, as some take it, the boundary or territory of the Chaldeans, or the high land of the Chaldeans, or, as Ewald puts it, the Chaldean stronghold. At any rate, the name כַּשְׂדִּים is in the word ; and we have, accordingly, to regard

the Chaldean race as Abraham's ancestors.—The descent from the Chaldeans is through עֵבֶר. The LXX. viewed this name as an appellative (Gen. xiv. 13, where they translate the word, περάτης), and thus, I think, it is to be understood; it is the personification of the Chaldean races who cross the Euphrates, and therefore are called in Canaan the people from the other side. [Schrader, in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, Art. "Chaldaer," takes the ground that the Babylonian Chaldees, who were *Semites*, as their literary productions show, have nothing to do with the Armenian Chaldees, or Kurds, who were of *Aryan* or Indo-European origin. They dwelt in the part of Babylonia previously occupied by the Accadians.—D.]

(3) Our time gives itself to the study of the natural peculiarities of nations (*psychology of nations*), and especially of the peoples of antiquity. Here the question arises, how the peculiarities of the people of Israel can be understood as a product of the national spirit of the Semites. To this subject belong a number of observations in Lassen's *Indian Antiquities;* in the works of Rénan, partly in his *Histoire générale et système comparé des langues Sémitiques*, partly in the "Nouvelles considérations sur le caractère générale des peuples Sémitiques," etc., in the *Journ. Asiat.* 1859, iii.; Gustav Baur, in his *History of Old Testament Prophecy*, i. 1861; Diestel, on "The Idea of the People of Israel," in the *Monatschrift für die evang. Kirche der Rheinprovinz*, 1851; also, in particular, Grau, *Semiten und Indogermanen*, 1864, and others. Now there is no question that the peculiarities of the people of Israel proceeded from the common natural soil of the Semitic race. We find, to take a single example, the following explanation of the way in which the *Semitic and the Indogermanic character differ*, given by Gustav Baur: The contrast between the Indogermanic and the Semitic peculiarity of mind is to be traced back to the difference between a predominantly objective and a predominantly subjective tendency. The characteristic feature of the Semitic character is the energetic concentration of the subjectivity in the inmost ground of the Ego, and in this lies (*ut supra*, p. 134) a natural predisposition for the Old Testament religion.—This is hitherto the best statement of the case, and certainly does indicate a peculiarity of the Semitic race. The history of religion offers, in truth, interesting parallels to the Old Testament religion, in the sphere of the heathen religions, which confirm what Gustav Baur says. I would wish specially to point out also, that in the Semitic heathenism the view of the Divinity as a *legislative power* predominates; for the Star-gods of the heathen Semites are not represented merely as life-giving powers, but also as powers that *rule* life. Further, the idea of the Divinity as a jealous power, to which on man's side corresponds the *human defiance* which rebels against God, is peculiar to Semitic heathenism. This haughty Semitic defiance of God is prominently seen in the character of Israel's neighbors, Edom and Moab (comp. the pictures in Obad. 3; Isa. xvi. 6); even in the way that Job is depicted we may find a genuine Semitic trait of character, and to this corresponds the tough, defiant, natural force which lived in Israel: comp. Isa. xlviii. 4, "Thy neck is a sinew of iron, and thy brow is brass." The Old Testament in a multitude of passages point out in the natural character of the people of Israel an obstinate self-will striving against the divine will. But it is quite a different question whether the Old Testament religion is to be regarded purely as a *natural growth* of this Semitic character, and whether *monotheism* is a fundamental characteristic of the whole Semitic race. On the latter question we have a thorough investigation by Diestel, "The Monotheism of the oldest Heathenism specially of the Semites," in the *Jahrbüch für Deutsche Theol.* 1860, p. 669 ff. His answer to this inquiry is in the negative, and no wonder; for to what data must we principally appeal?—to such merely as are very modern in comparison with the antiquity of the human race, or even with the age of the patriarchs. The Old Testament itself remains the best source; and here, undeniably, an original monotheism presents itself, although one of a quite simple character. With this we also have to connect such features as the remarkable story of Melchizedek, presently to be spoken of. In special connection with Abraham's ancestors, we are distinctly told in the Old

Testament that false worship had already become familiar to them ; but this does not exclude the continued existence of monotheistic religion. Hengstenberg strikingly refers (*History of the Kingdom of God*, i. p. 120), in relation to the teraphim, to Gen. xxxi. 53, compared with vers. 19 and 30. In the first passage Laban swears by the "God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, the God of their father." Here is evidently presupposed a common God for Abraham's race, which had emigrated to Canaan, and for the branch of Terah's family which remained in Mesopotamia. But Laban designates the teraphim as *his* gods. By these inferior gods we must understand a sort of Penates. Thus a monotheistic worship may well be regarded as preceding the peculiar Old Testament religion, previous to Abraham.

[Comp. also the interesting work of F. Hommel, *Die Semiten und ihre Bedeutung für die Kulturgeschichte*, 1881, p. 27 f. In opposition to the view taken by many, that not only were the Semites generally polytheists, but also that the religion of Jehovah was developed from a polytheistic religion, he maintains that Assyriology has taken away the main props of the idea of the original polytheism of the Semites, in the evidence it furnishes that most of the gods hitherto considered as purely Semitic are of Sumero-Accadian and not of Semitic origin. To be sure we may in turn infer with Schultz (p. 107), from the fact that the Semites easily accepted the Accadian myths and the Pantheon of the Chaldean priests, that they had no antipathy to Polytheism. Schultz's view is, "the unity of God was not believed ; but little interest was taken in the plurality of divine powers conceived of as independent. *The* God to whom prayer was addressed, or who was conceived of as specially connected with an individual tribe, becomes distinctly prominent in the religious life." Accordingly we may speak at least of a tendency first to Henotheism, and then further to Monotheism in the Semitic religion.]

But now, is the Old Testament religion a further and natural development of the germ that already lay in the religion of the forefathers? This can be affirmed only under considerable limitations. The view that the Old Testament dispensation is a natural production of the religious genius of the people of Israel must be absolutely rejected. Against this the whole Old Testament furnishes the most decided testimony, presenting to us in a multitude of facts in Israel's history the distinction between the divine principle of life and the natural constitution of the race of revelation, and developing the difficulties arising therefrom in the divine education of the people. See § 5, note.

III. THE TIME OF THE THREE PATRIARCHS.

§ 23.

ABRAHAM (1).

Obedient to the divine call, Abram leaves Mesopotamia, accompanied by Lot, the ancestor of the Moabites and Ammonites, to go to Canaan, which is already (Gen. xii. 6) possessed by the tribes bearing this name. In solemn revelation God closes with him the *covenant of promise* (chap. xv.), in an act not exactly to be characterized as a sacrifice, but only meant to symbolize the gracious condescension of the covenant-instituting God (comp. § 80). On this follows, on the side of Abram, the taking upon himself the obligations of the covenant through *circumcision* (chap. xvii.). *Three points* are contained in the promises given to Abram (xii. 2 f., 7, xiii. 15 f., 18, xvii. 5–8, xviii. 18, xxii. 16–18) (2) 1. The land in which he himself continues all his life a stranger (xii. 6), and where he must even buy a place

for his grave (xxiii. 4, comp. Acts vii. 5), is to be given for an eternal possession to his descendants (3). 2. He who remains childless till his old age shall have an *innumerable posterity*, which is guaranteed by the changing of his name into אַבְרָהָם [father of a multitude]; and not Ishmael, the son of Hagar, who was born after the counsel of man (chap. xvi.), but *Isaac*, born contrary to the ways of nature, according to God's counsel (Rom. ix. 8), is to be the bearer and inheritor of the promise (4). 3. The seed of Abraham shall be made a *blessing* for all races and all nations of the earth (5). Still the electing grace of the covenant God, who calls Himself *El-Shaddai* [the Almighty God], (xvii. 1) as a witness of His controlling power in the natural world, is met on Abraham's side (xv. 6) by *faith*, which does not look at the course of nature, but holds fast to God's word of promise (comp. Rom. iv. 18; Heb. xi. 8–19), and endures victoriously the severest test in his willingness to offer the son of the promise (Gen. xxii.). In this faith, which is reckoned to him for righteousness, Abraham the friend of God (Isa. xli. 8; Jas. ii. 23) is the prophet (Gen. xx. 7), to whom is granted insight into the divine counsel (xvii. 17: "Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do?") when Sodom reels onward to judgment, and who has the privilege of free access to God in prayer (xviii. 23 ff., xx. 17). Nay, he becomes the father of all believers (Rom. iv.; Gal. iii.), and his name stands at the head of the three monotheistic religions of the world, even when looked at in a purely historical way. But this knowledge of the divine way is to be accompanied by a *walking* therein (Gen. xvii. 1). Moreover, according to Gen. xviii. 19, Jehovah "acknowledged," that is, chose, Abraham, "that he might command his sons after him to keep Jehovah's ways, doing justice and right, that Jehovah might bring upon Abraham all that He has said of him" (6). Accordingly the character of God's people is *ethically determined from the first*, and the passage (xviii. 19) shows that not all natural descendants belong to the true sons of Abraham and the heirs of the promise.—On the *relation of the religion of the patriarchs to the surrounding heathenism*, the narratives in Gen. xiv. 18–22 and chap. xxii. shed the most important light. In the former passage containing the story of *Melchizedek*, King of Salem, the type of a priesthood not inherited by bodily descent, but resting on the dignity of the person (Ps. cx. 4; Heb. vii.), we find a recognition of the identity of the God of Abraham and the Canaanite El-elyon (7). The second narrative has apparently an historical reference to the Canaanitish offerings of children. We must note here, that while it was *Elohim* who, according to ver. 1, tempted Abraham to offer his son, it is *Jehovah* who (ver. 11 ff.) hinders the sacrifice, approves the devotion that is willing to offer up the most beloved one, and commands the substitution of the sacrificial animal (8).

(1) That the whole history of the patriarchs has a *typical character*, has been generally acknowledged from the time of the Apostle Paul to our own day, and the only question is as to the theological and religious meaning of these Old Testament types. Philo, from his philosophical standpoint, interprets the symbolism and types of the patriarchal times as follows: Abraham is the symbol of the human spirit who wandered out from Haran, the place of sensual desires, to Canaan, the home of the spirit. For the rest, Abraham is to him the type of acquired virtue, Isaac of innate virtue, and Jacob of virtue won by practice, etc. Side by side with this we place Ewald's very superficial explanation in his *History of the People of Israel*, i. p. 291 f. According to him, a circle of twelve examples is here

brought before us in seven fundamental relationships. 1. In the three patriarchs, the pattern of the father of a family is represented; 2. In Sarah, the pattern of the mother, and in Hagar that of the concubine; 3. In Isaac, the pattern of the child; 4. In Isaac and Rebecca, the pattern of right betrothal and marriage (but Rebecca deceives her husband!); 5. In Leah and Rachel, the patterns of a wife beside one less loved; 6. In Deborah, the pattern of a nurse of heroes; 7. In Eliezer, the pattern of the house-servant or house-steward.—If we follow out the traits which the noble delineation of patriarchal life presents to us, according to the guidance of the New Testament, the result seems to be what we have given in the text.

(2) In regard to the three parts of the promise given to Abraham, note that if we divide Genesis into an original Elohistic writing and a Jehovistic supplement, the verses which contain the third part of the promise belong to the Jehovistic sections. This has also an *internal* ground, in so far as God in this covenant promise has especially to approve Himself as יְהוָה, as faithful to His covenant.

(3) It is certainly not without meaning that throughout the Old Testament the completion of the divine kingdom hinges on the land which was granted to Abraham, not by a right of nature, but by grace. Even prophecy knows no final fulfilment of the divine promise, in which this old promise of eternal possession of the Holy Land does not come true. Here, I am convinced, is a fundamental error of Hengstenberg's exegesis, when he absolutely will not admit in his spiritualizing interpretations that this is fixed as an essential and enduring feature of the divine promise. However we may judge of this matter from the standpoint of the New Testament—I do not enter on this dispute—from the standpoint of the Old Testament it must be maintained that, from the beginning of the founding of the covenant people to the close, the fulfilment of the promise and the completion of the divine kingdom attaches to the holy land of Canaan. [But the question still remains whether this may not be *the form of thought* under which the higher spiritual truth is conveyed. See Fairbairn, *Typology* i. p. 450–453.—D.]

(4) It is to be noticed how the Old Testament, from the first origin of the race of revelation, is careful to distinguish between a race of revelation *κατὰ σάρκα*, and *κατὰ πνεῦμα* to which the promise is given. We have already seen in the case of Abraham that the idea in Rom. ix. 8, *Οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα* is expressed in the clearest manner. This appears not only in the fact that not Ishmael, the son begotten by human design, but Isaac, becomes the bearer of the promise, and again in the choice of Jacob and the passing by of Esau; but also very distinctly in the conditions which are laid down for the attainment of the promises.

(5) The expression, "They shall *bless themselves* in Abraham's seed," can only mean, They shall wish for themselves the blessing of revelation which Abraham has, and *obtain* it through the race of Abraham. The passages are taken by modern exegesis to mean that they shall *wish* to be as happy as Abraham: but this is refuted by Jer. iv. 2, וְהִתְבָּרְכוּ בוֹ גוֹיִם, where בּוֹ refers to Jehovah. [Schultz also, p. 678 ff., finds in the passages in question, primarily only the thought, "wherever among the nations a blessing pronounced is received, there Abraham and his posterity shall be mentioned as the ideal of blessing from God." But even if this Niphal, נִבְרְכוּ, in Gen. xii. 3, etc., is taken not in the passive, but in the reflexive sense, it is not certain from this alone that his view is correct. The main question is, how the preposition בְּ is to be rendered. If now in Gen. xlvii. 20, the Piel בֵּרַךְ בְּ evidently means to bless *with*, "to wish the blessing of some one," the linguistic possibility of understanding the Hithpael as related to Niphal to mean "to wish for oneself the blessing of some one," cannot be doubted. It is equally certain that in Jer. iv. 2 we must translate: "they shall bless themselves in him, (Jehovah) i.e. expect from him salvation and blessing (cf. Graf's *Commentar.* s. l.) and so Is. lxv. 16.] What sense would there be in the explanation, that they should wish for themselves a happiness such as Jehovah has?

(6) Gen. xviii. 19 has often been wrongly explained. We must not translate, "For I *know of him*, that he will command," etc. The לְמַעַן can never have the meaning of the Greek ὅτι, which would necessarily be כִּי; but the יָדַע stands in the pregnant sense, which will be discussed more fully in the didactic section (§ 81), according to which it is a mark of the divine *πρόγνωσις*.

(7) On Gen. xiv. 18–22.—Salem is without doubt Jerusalem, which is called Salem in Ps. lxxxiv. 3; it is not a Salim farther north, as some modern critics think. It is no proof that the original name was not Salem, that Jerusalem in the time of the Judges appears under the name of Jebus, for it received the name Jebus from the Jebusites who were settled there; and here we may note that the king of Jerusalem who is met with in Josh. x. 1–3 is also called *Adonizedek*. [See Art. *Melchizedek* in Richm.] It is a point of special importance, that there is manifestly an acknowledgment of the God whose priest Melchizedek is, in the way in which Abraham does homage to Melchizedek. Melchizedek is called priest of אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, who appears later among the Phœnicians as Saturn. Abraham receives a blessing from this priest, and gives him the tenth of the booty. Certainly he distinguishes in a way (ver. 22) his God יְהוָה from the אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, but yet their identity is acknowledged. We have here therefore traces of an older, purer monotheism on Canaanitish ground, which is at first sight remarkable, because elsewhere the relation of the Old Testament God to the Canaanitish religion is sharply antagonistic. But here Movers' researches come in, *Phœnicier*, ii. 1, p. 105, in the most interesting manner. It is there shown that the worship of El or Kronos goes back to *another origin* than that of the Phœnician Baal, to which the Phœnician polytheism is attached, and that the former worship belonged specially to the Giblites in Byblus and Berytus, who are always definitely distinguished from the Phœnicians. We may maintain therefore, with the greatest probability, that we find here, in the midst of the Canaanitish religion, a remnant of an older and purer religion, which was perhaps preserved by a Semitic race dwelling among the Canaanites. For I at least am confident that the Old Testament, with its derivation of the Canaanites from Ham, is a higher authority than most newer critics. [It may be correct that this El-Elyon was brought to Canaan under Semitic influence, even if his identification with Kronos should fail to be established, and he were rather identical with Adonis, as Baudissin thinks probable, 1. p. 36, 216, 298 ff.; for the latter also is according to p. 300 f., identical with the Accadian-Babylonian Tammuz.]

(8) On Gen. xxii.—Scarcely any part of the Old Testament has been so much used as a proof-text by those dreamers who think that human sacrifice was originally a characteristic of the Old Testament religion, while, on the contrary, the tendency of the story leads directly to the excluding of human sacrifice from Jehovah-worship. This has been well observed by Ewald. But this does not remove the difficulty, that the God who will not have human sacrifice, nevertheless, at first, tempts Abraham to offer his son. It was Schelling who, in his *Philosophy of Revelation*, ii. p. 122 ff., first definitely pointed to the significant change of the names of God in this history. The chapter is a striking proof of how little is accomplished by an artificial dissection of Genesis according to the names of God. The chapter is joined together like cast-iron, and we cannot cut anything out of it. Formerly, before the importance of the change of the names of God was taken notice of, it was customary to have recourse to the cheap aid of interpolation. But how is this change to be understood? Schelling (*l.c.*) argues, that the God who, after the flood, uttered the words, "I will avenge the life of man at the hand of each man," cannot be the same who demanded from Abraham the life of his own son; that the principle that tempted Abraham to that action was essentially the same as induced the nations of Canaan to sacrifice their children; and that in the Old Testament the true God is reached through the false, and, as it were, bound to him.—But against this view it is quite conclusive that, in ver. 1, not the indefinite אֱלֹהִים without the article, but

הָאֱלֹהִים, is chosen for the tempting God.—Hengstenberg and others adopt a different explanation. In his *History of the Kingdom of God*, he puts the matter thus: "Jehovah commanded Abraham to offer up Isaac; he was ready to make this sacrifice, but understood the command in the same sense as if Moloch had said to him. 'Thou shalt sacrifice Isaac,' whereas the *mode of offering* was intentionally not more precisely fixed. The misunderstanding, although proceeding from Abraham and falling to his account, was nevertheless willed by God."—Kurtz, in his *History of the Old Covenant*, i. p. 263, seems to have given the right explanation. He says: Abraham must have been conscious that the way that led to the perfecting of his faith was the way of renunciation and self-denial. The sight of the Canaanite sacrifices of children must have led Abraham to self-examination, whether he would be strong enough in renunciation and self-denial to do what those heathen did, if his God desired it from him. But if this question was once made the subject of discussion in Abraham's heart, it had also to be brought to a definite and real decision. That was the substratum for the divine demand in Abraham's soul. Objectively, the following are the deductions from this point of view: The culminating point of worship in the religions of nature was human sacrifice. The covenant religion had to separate itself in this respect from heathenism; the truth in it had to be acknowledged, and the falsehood denied. In the command to offer up Isaac, the truth of the conviction that human life must be sacrificed as an unholy thing, is acknowledged; and by the arresting intervention of God, the hideous distortion of this truth which had arisen in heathenism is condemned and rejected.—If we look at Deut. xiii. 3, where it is said that God will prove the people by false prophets, it is not necessary for us, in expounding Gen. xxii. 1, to suppose any misunderstanding on Abraham's part; but it seems to me that the matter is best explained by looking at it, with Kurtz, in the light of an educational command.—Comp. also on the Value of History for the Development of the Old Testament Idea of Sacrifice, **§ 121, note 1.**

§ 24.

ISAAC AND JACOB.

Very little is recorded of the life of Isaac; he walked in the footsteps of his father, and the divine promises given to the latter were renewed to him (Gen. xxvi. 2–5). Of his twin-sons was chosen, as bearer of the promise, not Esau, who had the advantage of birthright, but ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ μένῃ (Rom. ix. 11), Jacob, the second-born son. The fundamental thought connected with the divine guidance of Jacob's life is, that in spite of all human hindrances, the divine counsel reaches its goal, and that even human sins must serve for its realization, although they are punished none the less. By the sin of Jacob and his mother, Isaac's purpose, which was in opposition to the promise to Jacob (Gen. xxv. 23), is thwarted; yet Jacob's sin is visited on him (1) in the straits he experienced in his wanderings (xxvii. 42 f.), which were occasioned by his artifice against Esau, and particularly in the sorrows afterwards prepared for him by his sons, when he who had preached deception must himself in like manner be deceived. The covenant promise given to him at the beginning of his journey to Mesopotamia, in the theophany at Bethel, in order to strengthen him for the years of exile (xxviii. 10 ff.), is confirmed at the same place on his return (xxxv. 9 ff.), after he has gained for himself and his race in the night-long wrestling at Jabbok, which forms the turning-point of his life, the new and holy name of *Israel*, characteristic of his divine calling (xxxii. 24 ff.). The primary

meaning of this story is, that Jacob, whose courage fails before his brother, and the reward of whose wiles threatens to be lost at one blow, is shown how man, despairing in his guilt, must wrestle out his cause with God, but that when he has gained the blessing from God, he has no more to be afraid of from any man. At the same time, Jacob's combat, when he *first wrestles with bodily strength*, is perhaps a picture of the perverseness of his former life, in which he believed himself to be able to force the fulfilment of the promise by the continual use of carnal means, and had made it difficult enough for the divine leadings to become master of him. His becoming lame is then meant to show that God does not permit Himself to be forced by natural strength. But then Jacob becomes victorious by the *weapon of prayer* (comp. Hos. xii. 4 f.). As the natural character of Jacob, the intriguing holder of the heel—the tough, shrewd man—prefigures the natural character of the nation that descended from him, so the spiritual character of God's people is prefigured (2) in יִשְׂרָאֵל, the wrestler with God.

(1) It is a great error, particularly of popular handbooks, that it is thought necessary to canonize the wily intrigues of Jacob and his mother related in Genesis. The attempt to justify such conduct goes against the conscience of a child. But such a treatment of the history of Jacob rests on a gross misunderstanding of that which Genesis itself teaches us as to the divine leading of Jacob. The text shows wherein lies the doctrinal value of this history.

(2) On Gen. xxxii. 24 ff.—To the insipid mockery which the despisers of the Bible are so ready to pour out on this story we pay no attention. The story has been properly appreciated even from a free point of view by Herder, and afterward in particular by Umbreit ("Der Busskampf Jacobs," *Studien und Kritiken*, 1848, p. 113 ff.). It is common, especially in the practical use of the passage, to limit oneself to seeing in Jacob's struggle a symbol of wrestling in prayer, which does not become wearied until it wins the blessing. So also Auberlen in the article "Jacob," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* vi. p. 376 f. I cannot share this view, and agree with Kurtz's conception (*History of the Old Covenant*, i. 331), according to which a double wrestling must be distinguished in the manner given in the text.—Hengstenberg turns the story into a visional occurrence.

§ 25.

THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

In the *twelve sons of Jacob* is given the basis of the covenant people destined to possess the land of Canaan (1). Nevertheless, a long period of expectation in exile and slavery is first prescribed (comp. Gen. xv. 13 ff.) to Jacob's descendants. The completion of the divine decree is introduced by the providential history of Joseph, who is raised to the helm of the Egyptian state to be the deliverer of his people, after a long trial of his faith, in which his earlier vanity was to be humbled (comp., for the religious value of the history, especially xlv. 5–8, l. 20). Israel must a second time turn his back on the promised land, although with a renewal of the promises received (xlvi. 2 ff.) (2). Jacob dies in Egypt after having predicted the future of the tribes descending from his sons, in his prophetic blessing (chap. xlix.), which looks far beyond the time in which his descendants continue strangers. The twelve tribes are here portrayed, partly according to their place in theocratic history, and partly according to their geographical rela-

tionship, while at the same time Jacob's words rest on ethical and psychological considerations. But, according to the Old Testament view, the blessing and curse of parents are not magic spells possessing in themselves the power, ascribed to them in heathenism, to set in motion forces of blessing or vengeance: they have force only so far as they serve the divine decrees, which may be fulfilled, according to circumstances, in a quite different sense from that intended by him who blesses or curses. (This is shown in Isaac's blessing, chap. xxvii.) Among the twelve Joseph is especially prominent, who (comp. xlviii. 5) is to become a mighty double tribe in his two sons Manasseh and Ephraim, of whom the latter is preferred, although he is the younger (xlviii. 14 ff.) Nevertheless it is not to him that the sovereignty is promised; nor to Reuben, the first-born son, who is declared to have forfeited his birthright by the shameful deed which he had formerly committed; nor to Levi, who was afterwards highly honored (comp. in particular Deut. xxxiii. 8 ff.), but whose dispersion in Israel, which was subsequently connected with his high calling, is uttered as a curse (Gen. xlix. 7) (3). On the other hand, it is Judah who is specially chosen as the bearer of the promise, and who is characterized as he upon whom that dominion over the nations shall rest, to which xxvii. 29 already pointed. Compare 1 Chron. v. 2, according to which passage the birthright, the בְּכוֹרָה, is Joseph's portion in the shape of a double inheritance (comp. § 106); but out of Judah is to come the נָגִיד, the prince of Israel (4). In making provision for the place of their burial (xlvii. 29 ff., comp. l. 4 ff.), Jacob, and afterward Joseph (l. 25 f.; comp. Heb. xi. 22), testify their faith in the divine promise.—In the *covenant of promise* with the three patriarchs rests, for the consciousness of the people of Israel, the guarantee of the gracious and holy guidance of the people (comp. Ex. ii. 24; Deut. iv. 37, vii. 8, viii. 8, 18, etc.). Hence, in the Old Testament stage of revelation, God is called the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* (Ex. iii. 6, 15; comp. 1 Kings xviii. 36, Ps. xlvii. 10).

(1) That there are twelve tribes is explained by the Old Testament from the number of the sons of Jacob, which gives no trace of any other derivation than the genealogical one [Art. "Stämme Israels," in Herzog, 1st ed.].

(2) In connection with the references to Egypt, Eber's work, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, of which as yet only the first volume is published, 1868 [announced as soon to appear in an English translation], is worthy of all praise. It contains very important information on archæological and historical matters. Comp. also Hengstenberg, *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, 1841, and the Art. "Joseph" in Herzog's 2d ed., by Orelli.

(3) Gen. xlix. 7: "Cursed be their wrath, because it was so fierce: and their fury, because it was grievous: I will divide them in Jacob, and disperse them in Israel." Compare Kurtz, *History of the Old Covenant*, i. p. 339 f., in elucidation of the treacherous and bloody act of vengeance executed by Levi, for the dishonor of his sister Dinah, on the Shechemites, who were first made defenceless.

(4) Gen. xlix. is a *crux interpretum*. In respect to the passage as a whole I share neither the view of some who see here a testament written down with the exactness of a notary, nor the widespread view which regards it as the production of a later poet.—For this [supposed later] poet, in whatever age we place him, comes into conflict with some parts of the poem. Particularly what is said concerning Levi, whose race occupied a position of eminence from the time of Moses onward, neither agrees with the time of the Judges, nor with the time of David or Solomon. But in ver. 10 it is claimed there is a clear indication that the

chapter was written in the time of the Judges. Shiloh is there taken to mean the town of that name in Ephraim, and the passage is rendered: "until he comes to Shiloh," where the sanctuary, the centre of the theocracy, was. But if the poem is of this age, the principate which it assigns to Judah is irreconcilable with historical data in the time of the Judges. It becomes necessary to extend and emphasize in an unjustifiable manner the circumstance that Judah went at the head of the people in the war of conquest, in order to justify what is said of him. If we are to speak of a principate of any tribe in the time of the Judges, we should rather name the tribe of Ephraim in the midst of which at one time actually a kingdom was set up in Shechem. [Schultz, in his review already cited, pronounces the value of this book to be very much impaired by its making use of a narrative "which, for example, does not hesitate to attribute the blessing of Jacob to the patriarch himself." And in his *Old Testament Theology*, p. 667, he adds, "No one who understands the nature of prophecy will doubt for a moment the character of these utterances." His principal reason is that these utterances are to a great extent of no importance for the present and future of most of the tribes. But, if they were really so unimportant for the tribes, how did they ever come to be placed in the mouth of the honored patriarch? This fact is an evidence that "these unimportant geographical and statistical notices" were not so unimportant in the view of the Israelites, as our modern scholar is pleased to regard them. These "notices" contained what entered very deeply into the life of a tribe. Schultz himself afterward says that the present sufferings, joys, and hopes of the tribes became predictions which were placed in the mouth of their dying ancestor Israel. See the remarks of Orelli in answer to Schultz, in the Art. "Jacob" in Herzog, vi. p. 443, and the view of Bredenkamp, p. 172 f.: "by the utterance concerning Levi, the authenticity of the blessing is, to every candid mind, inviolably signed and sealed."]—Any one who really goes deeper into the intellectual habits, not only of Israel, but of Eastern, and indeed of all antiquity, will not be satisfied with the view that a later poet sits down and writes a poem which he puts in the mouth of the father of the nation; on the contrary, we certainly find in the old world a real tradition of such words of blessing and cursing, uttered by the fathers concerning their descendants, and such utterances influence the fortunes of the latter in a very intelligible way. I cannot, therefore, take any other view of Jacob's sayings, than that the father of the tribes divided the inheritance and characterized each of the sons, and that this testament of the father continued to live in the mouth of the tribes. The antique character of the sayings is shown by the peculiar *animal symbols—Dan*, the serpent; *Naphtali* the gazelle, etc.—sayings which could not have been called forth by the poetry of a later age, but only by the simple pastoral life of the patriarchs.—With regard to the *theological meaning* of these sayings, it is taught by this blessing, that in the divine kingdom things do not occur in the way of nature, but according to divine choice. Neither he who should have taken the lead by right of birth, nor yet the father's darling, is called to stand at the head of the kingdom of God. Since ethical and psychological considerations appear in many points of what is said concerning the several tribes—when, as Herder has so beautifully expressed it, Jacob's "mind is strengthened from heaven to note the slumbering destiny in the soul of his sons, and to open this hidden book in their separate traits of character and action"—we may ask if there is not also something of the same kind in the case of Judah, the fourth son according to age, but now placed first. In the text it is not expressly brought forward. In the designation of Judah as a *lion* we may perhaps find a reference to his noble nature. But the passage Gen. xliv. 32 f. may be cited, where Judah presents himself as surety, to go to prison or to bondage for his brother Benjamin that he may be free. It is hardly to be regarded as forced to discern a divine fitness in the fact that *Judah* was to be the ancestor of Him who presented Himself as surety for all.—The much-discussed passage concerning Shiloh will be treated of on a subsequent page (§ 229).

IV. FOURTH AGE. THE TIME OF MOSES AND JOSHUA.

I. THE DELIVERANCE OF ISRAEL FROM EGYPTIAN BONDAGE.

§ 26.

Condition of the People of Israel in Egypt.

At the close of the time of the patriarchs, the biblical account passes silently over a long period, in which Israel grows up into a people. For that quiet process of increase by which the families grew into a nation offered nothing which the people could remember as historically important (1). The Old Testament gives the following intimations of the *condition of the people in Egypt*. In part they seem to have kept to the pastoral life of their fathers in Goshen; they may have wandered from there into the stretch of land on the eastern boundary, since the obscure passage 1 Chron. vii. 21 is probably to be connected with an occurrence taking place during the stay of Israel in Egypt (2). From Num. xxxii. we conclude that the two tribes of Reuben and Gad gave themselves to cattle-breeding. But speaking generally, the people who were settled in fixed residences, and partly even in towns, must have already begun an agricultural life (comp. Ex. i. 14, Num. xi. 5, Deut. xi. 10). As the Egyptians and Israelites lived together (Ex. iii. 22, xii. 33 ff.), the people could not have remained unaffected by the *Egyptian culture*, which was at that time already very far advanced (3). The *political organization of the people had developed itself in a genealogical way*, which corresponds to the natural character of the Semites, who are characterized by strong family and tribal attachment. The people (according to iii. 16) are represented by the *elders* (זְקֵנִים), who were probably taken from the chief families. Besides this, the people were under שֹׁטְרִים, [A.V. *officers*, lit. *writers*], who in like manner were taken from their own body, but were themselves subordinate to Egyptian overseers (v. 6 ff.) (comp. § 98). With regard to the *religious condition* of the nation, we find that among the mass of the people the remembrance of the God of their fathers, and of the promises given to them, had to be reawakened. The purer worship of God which we find among the patriarchs had been displaced by *idol-worship*, as may be concluded partly from express testimony (Josh. xxiv. 14; Ezek. xx. 7 ff., xxiii. 8, 19), and partly from the idol-worship to which the people gave themselves during their wanderings in the wilderness. The worship of the calf at Sinai, Ex. xxxii., is to be explained as an imitation of the Egyptian worship of *Apis* or *Mnevis;* the service of he-goats (שְׂעִירִים) mentioned in Lev. xvii. 7 points to the service of Mendes (the Egyptian Pan; Herodotus, ii. 46). The service also of the fire god *Moloch* or *Milcom*, which was spread in the lands bounding Egypt on the east, must, as is shown by the rigid prohibition, Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2, have even at that time penetrated among the people. As this idol, who is essentially the jealous power of nature, forms the heathen caricature of the Holy One of Israel, the אֵל קַנָּא [the jealous God], the mixing of his worship with the service of Jehovah, mentioned in Amos v. 26, is more easily understood (4). All this shows that during the stay in Egypt the foundation was laid of the commingling of religions which appeared

in different forms in the following centuries, and which was in general characteristic of Israel, which never was independently productive in polytheistic forms of worship.

(1) It may seem strange that we have so considerable *a blank in the history between Genesis and Exodus*, and that the long period of time from Jacob's going down into Egypt and his death, and until Moses' birth, is passed silently over. But simple tribal life, such as we must suppose Israel's to have been in those centuries, forms no history. What sort of a history had the Arabians in the thousand years previous to Mohammed? But beside this, Israel has no history generally except so far as it is the organ of revelation. How full of blanks is the historical account of the centuries in the time of the Judges, on account of the broken state of the theocratic life! and how little do we know of the exile, which yet belongs entirely to the historical time! or of the centuries from Ezra to the Maccabees, and beyond them! It is the peculiarity of Israel to possess history and historical literature in the full sense of the words only in proportion as it realizes its vocation in the history of the world.

(2) In 1 Chron. vii. 21, according to the most likely explanation of the ambiguous passage, an incursion of the Ephraimites on Gath is recounted, starting, it is supposed, from the southern highlands of Canaan. The older view, that an occurrence in the time of the stay in Egypt is spoken of, and not, as Bertheau and others think (understanding Ephraim, ver. 22, as the whole body of the tribe), an occurrence belonging to the post-Mosaic time, has at least the wording of the passage in its favor. Comp. also Kurtz, *The History of the Old Covenant*, ii. p. 178 [and Köhler i. p. 166].

(3) It is a mistake to regard the Israelites at their exodus from Egypt as a rude race of nomads, in whom we may not presuppose even the smallest beginnings of culture. They appear in the Pentateuch as an *unmanageable*, but not as an *uncultivated* people. While, for example, to take a single illustration, the Pentateuch gives no trace of the art of writing in the time of the patriarchs, this is presupposed as employed among the people when they went out of Egypt, as the name of their functionaries which were taken from the people shows—they were שֹׁטְרִים, that is, *writers*. In Egypt, indeed, as is shown by the monuments, writing was at that time a thing long in use.

(4) It is not long since it was the fashion to think that the original worship of Israel was the worship of Saturn, or, as Saturn was identified with Milcom, the service of Moloch (comp. Vatke, Ghillany, Daumer, and others).—It certainly cannot be denied that this idolatrous worship belongs to that ancient period; it belongs to the oldest time and to the youngest, and after disappearing for centuries, becomes prominent again after the time of Ahaz; and, as is stated in the text, there is a certain connection between Moloch and אֵל קַנָּא [the jealous God], as the Holy One of Israel is called, only with the difference that the latter is an ethical power, the former a consuming natural power, which must be reconciled by human sacrifice. But to represent what the Old Testament condemns as the true foundation of the worship of Jehovah, is a piece of arbitrariness such as has often defaced the treatment of the Old Testament. [Against the entire view that the Israelitish monotheism was developed from a lower stage of natural religion, see the Art. "Götzendienst" in Riehm].—The much discussed passage, Amos v. 26, must not be understood as foretelling something future, as Ewald explains it: "So then ye shall lift up the pale of your king, and the scaffold of your images," referring to the carrying of the idols into captivity. Against this is the fact that this kind of worship is not mentioned as existing in the kingdom of the ten tribes. The proper explanation is: "Ye bore the tabernacle of your king and the pillar of your images" [or better, since the names of Kewan and Sakkuth are found as gods in the cuneiform inscriptions, to regard these words as proper names, and to render, "Sakkuth your king and Kewan your image." See Bredenkamp, p. 87 f.], etc., that is, during the wandering in the wilderness.

§ 27.

The Course of the Deliverance from Egypt.

The *deliverance from Egypt* is thus related in the book of Exodus. To prevent the extraordinary increase of the people which excited their apprehensions, the Egyptians burdened the people with intolerable tasks, and at last the royal decree went forth that all the new-born boys should be killed. In this deepest humiliation, in which the people (comp. Ezek. xvi. 5) could be compared to a helpless infant cast away in its blood, the fulfilment of the promises given to the fathers was to take place ; and, in accordance with this, *El-Shaddai* was to show Himself as *Jehovah*. The divine instrument for this was *Moses*. After he had been providentially saved from death as a child (Ex. ii. 1 ff.), and had been brought up at the royal court (*πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων*, Acts vii. 22), he appears in manhood (in the fortieth year of his life, according to tradition ; see Acts vii. 23) in the midst of his oppressed people, kills an Egyptian who is maltreating an Israelite, and flees, when this deed becomes known, into the Arabian wilderness (1). What he failed to do when trying in his own might, he was to accomplish forty years after as an instrument in God's hand (2). When Moses had accredited himself to the people as a divine messenger, he first demanded of Pharaoh liberty for Israel to go into the wilderness, in order there to celebrate a sacrificial festival to Jehovah. As Pharaoh repels the request with scorn, and increases to the uttermost the oppression of the people, there follows the divine declaration that Israel shall now be brought out of Egypt by great judgments, and that thus the existence of Jehovah as the Lord of the world shall be manifested to Israel as well as to the Egyptians (comp. Ex. vi. 6 f., viii. 18, ix. 16). The *ten plagues* which are sent on the Egyptians (Ex. vii.–xii., comp. with Ps. lxxviii. 43 ff., cvi. 26 ff.) are mostly connected with natural events and conditions which frequently recur in Egypt. The order of their succession stands in close connection with the natural course of the Egyptian year from the time of the first swelling of the Nile, which generally happens in June, to the spring of the following year (3). But partly the severity of the plagues, and partly their connection with the word of Moses (comp. especially viii. 5 f.), make them signs of Jehovah's power. In them the triumph of the true God over the gods of the land (xii. 12 ; Num. xxxiii. 4), is shown, and thus they serve as a pledge of the triumph of the divine kingdom over heathenism (comp. Ex. xv. 11, xviii. 11). Even in the *heathen accounts* of the departure of Israel from Egypt by Manetho (Josephus, *c. Ap.* i. 26, and Diodorus, *Biblioth.* lib. xl. fragm.), it comes out undeniably that there was a great religious struggle (4). The plagues rise from step to step until, after the tenth plague, viz. the killing of the first-born of the Egyptians, which takes place in the same night with the institution of the passover in Israel, the Egyptians, full of fear, drive the people from the land (5).—Because the people are not yet matured for war with the nations of Canaan, Moses does not lead them to Canaan by the nearest road, but chooses the roundabout way through the wilderness of the peninsula of Sinai. But scarcely have the people turned in this direction, and encamped close by the Red Sea, probably in the plain of the modern Suez, when Pharaoh draws near. Shut in by the enemy's forces, and by mountains

and the waves of the sea, the people receive the direction to go forward in faith. A storm drives back the water, Israel passes safely through the sea in the tumult of the elements, led by God like a flock of sheep (Ps. lxxvii. 17–21 ; Isa. lxiii. 11 ff.) ; but the Egyptian army which follows is buried by the waves. "And the people feared Jehovah, and believed in Jehovah and His servant Moses" (Ex. xiv. 31). In this form, the act of divine deliverance was handed down in Israel (comp. Ps. lxxviii. 12 ff., cvi. 8 ff., cxiv.), a type of future redemption, ever again revived in their memory by the yearly anniversary (Isa. xi. 15 f.).—The *duration of Israel's stay in Egypt* is fixed as 430 years, according to Ex. xii. 40, comp. Gen. xv. 13, against which the LXX. in the first passage reckon as part of the number 430 the stay of the patriarchs in Canaan, and thus reduce the time of the stay in Egypt by one half (6).

(1) Comp. the explanation of this narrative, Acts vii. 24 f. : "Ἐνόμιζε δὲ συνιέναι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς διὰ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς σωτηρίαν· οἱ δὲ οὐ συνῆκαν."

(2) In the view of this narrative given by Ewald (*History of Israel*, ii. pp. 53, 70 ff.), Israel is represented in an entirely different light from that which we find in the book of Exodus. His view is substantially this : Before the leading out of the people, a powerful impulse seized them, "the most extraordinary exertions and most noble activities of the spirit wrestling for freedom." Then Moses became prominent among them, one of the greatest heroes that ever lived,—a man, indeed, of matchless greatness, who must have worked with wonderful energy and success. A religious struggle ensues between Israel and the Egyptians, the result of which is the departure of the Israelites from Egypt. "The confident spirit once excited in the people must have remained unweakened in the now coming crisis at the Red Sea," as happens when "at the right time a favorable wind brings to the light the deposited germs." Thus the march through the Red Sea gained a fundamental significance for the theocracy.—This is all very well ; but in the Old Testament the honor is not given to the *people*, but the whole history tends to show what *divine* discipline can make out of a sunken people. The Old Testament gives no intimation of a mighty spiritual movement among the people in Egypt (comp. also the conception in Acts vii. 25 ff.). Ezekiel compares the nation to a helpless infant cast away without mercy, lying in its blood. In regard to Moses, the story certainly indicates a preparation for his future calling ; but if according to tradition (Acts vii. 22) he was educated in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, even Ewald himself remarks that "certainly the influence of Egyptian education was in the end more negative than positive" (*History of Israel*, ii. p. 56). The point brought forward in the text is here of especial significance : how the first appearance of Moses when he slew the Egyptian, which is spoken of by Stephen (Acts vii. 25) as a signal for the people,—how this arbitrary deed led first to a long exile for Moses, and how only at a later period, when he no longer counted himself capable, he was to reach success (comp. also Auberlen, *The Divine Revelation*, i. p. 101 ff.).

(3) Eichhorn was the first to show, in his *De Ægypti anno Mirabili*, how the whole course of the plagues is connected with the course of the Egyptian year. The full treatment of this topic by Hengstenberg, *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, is particularly interesting. [Comp. also the art. "Plagen ägyptische" in Riehm.]

(4) According to a remark in § 3, the Old Testament theology has, in distinction from the history of Israel, to reproduce the facts as they continued to live in the spirit of the organs of revelation, and formed the basis of religion, while researches like those on the Hyksos are relegated to the history of the Israelites. For the latter question, see Ewald's *History of Israel*, ii. p. 76 ff., one of the best parts of his book.

(5) Of the various passages in the chapters that treat of the exodus, Ex. xii.

35 f., compared with xi. 2 f., may be discussed more at large on account of its celebrity. In iii. 22, it is said, "Each woman shall ask from her neighbor vessels of silver and gold, and clothes;" and ver. 21, "I will give this people favor in the eyes of the Egyptians, that when they go they may not go empty." Then it is said, xii. 35 f., "The children of Israel did according to the word of Moses, and asked of the Egyptians silver and golden vessels, and clothes; and Jehovah gave the people favor in the eyes of the Egyptians." On Luther's and A. V.'s interpretation of the words which follow וַיְנַצְּלוּ אֶת־מִצְרָיִם, "so that they *lent* to them, and they *spoiled* the Egyptians," the difficulty arises, how an actual theft can be here commanded. It is not necessary to show that theft is in decided opposition to the moral spirit of Mosaism. The solution which Ewald adopts in his *History of Israel*, ii. p. 68, is, that the spoiling is, in the sense of the story, no theft, because the subsequent breach of faith on Pharaoh's part made it impossible to give back the borrowed property, and that this turn of affairs contained at the same time a sort of divine retribution in favor of Israel, inasmuch as it appears, when looked at from the ultimate issue, simply as the equalizing act of a higher providence standing over human inequalities, that they who were long oppressed by the Egyptians should in this manner be compensated. This solution may be right so far, but it is not at all necessary. Winer, in his Lexicon, has with good reason left out the meaning "lend" which is given to the word הִשְׁאִיל. The word appears in the Hiphil only once more in the Old Testament, 1 Sam. i. 28, and there it is quite incorrect to translate that Hannah *lends* her son Samuel to the Lord. She wishes to *give* him to God in giving him to the sanctuary. The word rather signifies *dedit alicui quid petenti*, according to Winer. In the נָצַל, xii. 36, compared with iii. 22, no robbery is implied, but a simple taking away; in what sense, the connection must decide. Accordingly the sense of the passage is, that the Egyptians are glad to get rid of the Israelites at this price; so that Ewald's view, that we have here an act of remuneration, that the children of Israel might thus receive a compensation, is still applicable. But when Ewald and others see in the matter also the quite different meaning that Israel took from the Egyptians the true religion, the right utensils of sacrifice, and along with them the true holy things and sacrifices, nothing of this lies in the story, and this construction is very far-fetched.

(6) Certainly in the genealogy, Ex. vi. 16-20, Moses and Aaron form the fourth generation from Levi; but it follows from other genealogies that links are left out in this genealogy. That in Num. xxvi. 29 ff. has six generations; that in 1 Chron. ii. 3 ff., seven; that in 1 Chron. vii. 22 ff., as many as ten for the same period. The enormous increase of the population of Israel can only be explained by accepting a longer period.

II. THE INSTITUTION OF THE COVENANT OF THE LAW, AND THE MARCH THROUGH THE WILDERNESS.

§ 28.

Educational Aim of the March through the Wilderness. The Covenant of the Law established.

In God's great deed at the Red Sea a pledge was given to the people for the happy completion of the newly commenced march, for victory over all their enemies, and for their introduction to the promised land, as foretold in Moses' song of praise, Ex. xv. 13 ff. But first the people, scarcely escaped from the rod of correction, from the flesh-pots and the idols of Egypt, must be educated, sifted, and purified for their calling; and this educational aim is secured by the

march in the wilderness, where the people are thrown entirely on their God, where they become aware of their need of help through want and privation, and are to be exercised in obedience and trust; but to prove at the same time, in the experience of the divine leading and help, what they have in their God (Deut. viii. 2 5, 14-18; comp. also the typical application, Hos. ii. (16) (1). In the third month, Ex. xix. 1 (according to the probable indication of the date in this passage, which indeed is not clear), on the first of the month, the people reached Sinai, where Jehovah, as the Holy One, in which attribute He has already manifested Himself in the redemption of the people (xv. 11, comp. Ps. lxxvii. 14-16), founds the theocracy and enters on His *kingship* (comp. Ex. xv. 18). After the people have been told of their election above all nations as the divine property, and have been prepared by consecration for the solemn act, follows the promulgation of the fundamental law by which Jehovah binds Israel's race to a holy constitution, and thus "He became King in Jeshurun" (Deut. xxxiii. 5). By the *covenant offering*, Ex. xxiv., the entrance of the people into communion with the holy God is sealed. Both the *electing love* of God, who here betroths Himself to His people (Ezek. xvi. 8, "then becamest thou mine"), and the *menacing severity* of the Holy One of Israel and His law (comp. Heb. xii. 18 ff.), appear in the whole form by which the covenant of law was established. With regard to grace and judgment, Israel is from this time forward the privileged people of God (2).

(1) On the *significance of the march through the wilderness*, compare Auberlen's book, *The Divine Revelation*, i. p. 136: "That they might be cast on Him alone, and not become immediately re-entangled in the world's affairs, Israel is not led directly from Egypt to Canaan, but by long journeys through the wilderness, where the life of nature and history stands still, and the people are alone with their God. Since the wilderness is without nourishment, and without so much as a path, the simplest sign of human culture, He undertakes to feed them with manna; He undertakes their guidance in the pillar of cloud and fire, that herein too the people may be directly pointed to Him, and accustomed to the thought of Him."—It is this meaning of the wilderness-wandering of Israel as a process of education which makes it so important, not simply historically, but also religiously; and in this we do not read something in the Old Testament history which only occurs to ourselves as we meditate on it; but this is the point of view under which the Old Testament itself—the Pentateuch, and especially Deuteronomy, from which a few chief passages have been brought forward in the text, as well as prophecy—presents the history of the Israelites.—In Hos. ii. 16, the future restoration of Israel is represented as a new guidance through the wilderness. In the preceding passage it is foretold that God will remove Israel into a position of separation, where it can no more have intercourse with the idols to which it has given itself. This is the first stage. And now, ver. 14: "Behold, I will entice her, and lead her into the wilderness, and will speak to her heart;" the people shall be placed in a position where they are thrown entirely on God, as Israel was once in the Arabian wilderness, to learn by experience what it has in its God.

(2) On the establishment of the covenant at Sinai, compare the words of Karl Ritter, the geographer, in his beautiful essay, "The Peninsula of Sinai, and the Path of the Children of Israel to Sinai," in Piper's *Evangelical Calendar*, 1852, p. 35: "A strange astonishment seizes us when contemplating this great mysterious miracle of miracles, that the first germ of a purer and higher religious development of the human race, sunk in this horrible mountainous wilderness, was to be fructified by such patriarchal simplicity, and further unfolded and handed down from generation to generation, by a people so sunk in slavery, so lustful, and so

often a covenant-breaking people, as the people of Israel were, and that by them it was to be guarded as the most holy jewel for the whole future of the nations. Yet the divine similes of the sower, of the mustard seed, and of the leaven, find here their earliest application."

§ 29.

The First Breach of the Covenant. Order of the Camp. Departure from Sinai. Sentence on the People.

In consequence of the establishment of the covenant, Jehovah designs to make His dwelling among His people. Hence the laws touching the arrangement of the tabernacle are next given in Ex. xxv. ff. (1). But before this is carried out the people have already broken the covenant, by falling into idolatry in the absence of Moses. Moses executes judgment on the idolaters ; and on this occasion the tribe of *Levi*—whose zeal now takes fire, not, like their father's (Gen. xxxiv.), for the wounded family honor, but for God's honor—obtains its consecration (Ex. xxxii. 26–29 ; comp. also Num. xxv. 11, Deut. xxxiii. 9 f.) (2). But Moses goes before Jehovah, offering himself for the people as the victim of the curse, and implores by repeated intercession the divine mercy till he has obtained pardon. Thus *the first breach of the covenant leads to a further disclosure of the Divine Being ;* and to God's former names are added the new ones : *merciful, gracious, long-suffering* God (Ex.xxxiv. 6). But in Moses' offer to resign his personal salvation, if only his people may be delivered, the *idea of a reconciling mediation coming in for a sinful people appears for the first time* (comp. Rom. ix. 3) (3).—During the stay at Sinai, which was for about a year, the holy tabernacle is set up and dedicated, the ordinances of worship are regulated, and a number of other laws are given, in which are fixed with particular exactness all points by which in the regulation of the people's life their difference from the Egyptians and from the Canaanitish tribes is to be marked (comp., in particular, passages like Lev. xviii. 2 f., 24, xx. 23 f.). Hereupon the number of the people is taken, the tribe of Levi is introduced into the position ordained for it, and, lastly, the order of encampment is fixed, by which (Num. ii. and iii., comp. x. 13 ff.) the relation of Jehovah to the people as His army (as they are called, Ex. vii. 4), and at the same time their relations to each other, are distinctly expressed. In the middle is the holy tabernacle ; next to it, on the east, the priests encamp ; and on the three other sides the three families of the Levites ; then come the twelve tribes, arranged on the political division which separates Joseph into two tribes, in four triads, facing the four quarters of the heavens, each of which had a leading tribe with a banner at its head. Judah, Reuben, Ephraim, and Dan are the leading tribes ; and Judah, the first of them, encamping on the east, leads the whole procession.—In the second year, on the twentieth of the month, the *removal from Sinai* takes place. The people are to pass in a direct way through the wilderness of Paran to the promised land. They succeed—under repeated outbreaks of their stiffneckedness, and chastisements suffered on this account—in reaching Kadesh-Barnea, the southern boundary of Canaan. In the catalogue of the resting-places (Num. xxxiii.), the station Rithma (ver. 18) is probably to be looked for beside Kadesh. From this point Moses causes the land to be searched by twelve spies.

The accounts which these bring back raise a general insurrection. The measure of the divine patience is now exhausted. A wandering of forty years long in the wilderness is decreed against the people, during which time all those who have passed their twentieth year—that is, the whole body of men who were capable of war—are to be swept away, except Oshea, or Joshua as Moses calls him (Num. xiii. 16), and Caleb, who had no share in that offence (Num. xiv., comp. xxxii. 13, Josh. v. 6). Hence the history of the march through the wilderness is treated as a type of warning for all times in Ps. lxxviii., xcv. 8 ff. ; in the New Testament, in 1 Cor. x. 1–12, Heb. iii. 7 ff.

(1) The structure of the legislative portions of the Pentateuch belongs to the department of Old Testament Introduction. I only remark here that the *succession of the laws* has not the systematic arrangement of a formal code, but each law is put in the place in which its publication appears to be necessary. If this is taken into consideration, many inconsistencies supposed to have been found in these sections vanish. [According to some recent critics there may have been a tent under which the ark usually stood, but there was no tabernacle constituting the only legitimate sanctuary and centre of worship as described in the book of Exodus. According to Wellhausen, the tabernacle of Exodus is a pure fiction of the post-exilic period, derived from the temple of Solomon under the desire of making the prescribed central sanctuary appear as an original Mosaic institution. This theory is closely connected with the position that the Mosaic age knew nothing of a centralizing of worship, and that this latter idea did not exist as a fact until after the exile. A critical examination of this position is not possible within our limits. Compare Bredenkamp, especially chap. iii. But when Schultz (p. 155) observes, "A splendor like that described in the chapters in question, if we bear in mind the immense effort required to build the temple of Solomon, cannot be predicated, notwithstanding all apologetic shifts, of a troop of wandering shepherds, even if they were laden with Egytian booty"—the answer is, that the idea just now common, that the Israelites were a troop of wandering shepherds, is more than the facts of history will sustain. For how could the Israelites, held in bondage by Pharaoh, move about in the land as shepherds ? And if they could make a golden calf, why not the tabernacle ? Comp. Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Kultus*, p. 282 ff., and the article of P. Gerhard, "Is the tabernacle a fiction of the post-exilic age, or a Mosaic institution ?" in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, 1879, p. 526 ff.]

(2) It has already been shown in § 25, that in Jacob's prophetical utterances Levi received a curse rather than a blessing, on account of his passionate zeal manifested in the treacherous deed of blood (Gen. xxxiv.). Now the *turning of the curse into a blessing* is found in Ex. xxxii. 26–29, when Moses returns from the mountain, and sees the sin of the people with the golden calf. At his cry, "Hither to me, all ye who belong to the Lord !" the tribe of Levi gathers around him at once, sword in hand, and executes, without mercy, punishment on the idolaters. Deut. xxxiii. 9 f. refers to this history : "He who saith of his father and his mother, I see him not, and knoweth not his brothers, nor acknowledgeth his sons, . . . they shall teach thee thy laws, O Jacob," etc. Num. xxv. 6 13, the story of the zeal of Phinehas, is another explanatory parallel in the Pentateuch, in which this characteristic trait, which qualifies Levi for the priesthood, is pointed out.

(3) One of the most beautiful sections of the Pentateuch, in which Moses appears in all his greatness, is the story of his offering himself as *ἀνάθεμα*, if God will only forgive the people, —a thought which has been uttered by only one other than Moses, namely Paul, Rom. ix. 3 : *ηὐχόμην γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου*, etc. Comp., in particular, Bengel's *Gnomon* on this passage : Verba humana non sunt plane apta, quibus includantur motus animarum sanctarum : neque semper iidem sunt motus illi, neque in earum potestate

est, tale semper votum ex sese elicere. Non capit hoc anima non valde provecta. De mensura amoris in Mose et Paulo non facile est existimare. Eum enim modulus ratiocinationum nostrarum non capit : sicut heroum bellicorum animos non capit parvulus. Apud ipsos illos duumviros intervalla illa, quæ bono sensu ecstatica dici possunt, subitum quiddam et extraordinarium fuere. Ne in ipsorum quidem potestate erat, tales actus ex sese quovis tempore elicere, etc. In Genesis we have a mediatorial intervention, when Abraham wishes to intervene for Sodom and Gomorrah : but more remarkable is the intervention of Moses, who proposes to be blotted out of the book of life. K. Lechler rightly points out, in his treatise, "Bemerkungen zum Begriffe der Religion," in Ullmann's *Studien und Kritiken*, 1851, p. 782, that such lofty utterances of the religious life could not be framed from Schleiermacher's idea of religion.

§ 30.

The Wandering during Thirty-seven Years in the Wilderness, and the Events up to the Occupation of the Land on the East Side of Jordan.

The history of the Pentateuch passes over the following *seven-and-thirty years* almost wholly in silence. According to Deut. i. 46, a longer stay of the people in Kadesh must be presupposed. From this point the return march of the people into the wilderness took place by the stages registered in Num. xxxiii. 19 ff., in which wandering for thirty-seven years the march around Mount Seir, mentioned in Deut. ii. 1, is included. In the first month of the fortieth year, the people are again in Kadesh-Barnea. This second encampment is meant in Num. xx. 1. The new-grown race show the same stubbornness as the earlier one ; they contend with Moses and Aaron ; and as this time even the faith of these two wavers, to them also entrance into the land of rest is denied (Num. xx. 10, 12, comp. Ps. cvi. 32 f.). In Deut. i. 37 (comp. iii. 26), Moses and Aaron do not seek to be acquitted from their own guilt (see xxxii. 51); but the conscience of the people has to be touched, because their sin gave occasion to the guilt of the two (1). As the Edomites denied their brother-people the passage through their lands, Israel had to turn back a second time from the border of Canaan, and go around the mountains of Edom, in order to enter from the eastern side (Num. xx. 14 ff.). A new outbreak of the people's stubbornness draws upon them another chastisement, but at the same time supplies the occasion for a revelation of the saving power of faith (xxi. 4 ff.). The brazen *saraph* (a sort of serpent) which was suspended, is a symbol of the doing away of evil through the power and grace of God. To this the typical use in John iii. 14 attaches itself (2). Then follow, in the land on the east of Jordan, successful combats, as a testimony to Jehovah's faithfulness and a pledge of future victory. The Amorites and Og king of Bashan are conquered, and Israel encamps in the plains of Moab, opposite to Jericho, and separated from the Holy Land only by the Jordan. King Balak of Moab wishes to conjure away the danger by means of Balaam, the seer from Mesopotamia, and to arrest the path of the victorious people by means of his curse ; but the seer, overpowered by the Spirit of Jehovah, is compelled to bless Israel, and make known to the people its future splendor, and the brilliant victories and wide dominion which it is to have (xxiv. 17–19), while he declares the fall of the heathen world, and also the sub-

jugation of the world-power of Asia after its conquest of the people dwelling around them, by a power coming from the west (vers. 20–24) (3).—More successful were the Moabites and Midianites, when, at Balaam's advice (xxxi. 16), they enticed the people to the service of Baal-Peor, and the lewdness connected therewith. After vengeance has been taken on the Midianites for this (chap. xxxi.), the land which was conquered on the east of the Jordan, and which was especially adapted for the continuation of a pastoral life, is distributed to the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half of Manasseh (chap. xxxii.). This stretch of land does not belong to the promised land proper, the property of Jehovah (Josh. xxii. 19). It is limited to the territory on the west of the Jordan, according to the boundaries given in Num. xxxiv. 1 ff. But a territory of much wider extent was promised to the people (Gen. xv. 18) between the rivers Nile and Euphrates, or, according to the more precise statement (Ex. xxiii. 31), between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, the Arabian wilderness, and the Euphrates (comp. also Deut. i. 7, xi. 24, Josh. i. 4).—The new numbering of the people, which was made (Num. xxvi.) in the plains of Moab, shows the new-grown race to be numerically almost the same as before (601,730 men fit for war, against 603,550); but, on the other hand, the differences of number among the individual tribes are considerable, especially in the tribe of Simeon (comp. xxvi. 14 with i. 23), which has diminished to almost a third part of its former size, and, according to this, seems to have shared especially in the last visitation of punishment, as indeed, according to xxv. 14, the guilty prince Zimri was a Simeonite.

(1) In Num. xx. 10, Moses says to the people: "Hear, ye rebels; shall we indeed bring water to you out of the rock?" Upon this, Jehovah says to Moses and Aaron, ver. 12: "Because ye have not believed on me, to sanctify me before the people of Israel, ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I give them."—Deut. i. 37: "Also against me was Jehovah wroth for your sakes, and said, Also thou shalt not enter." Ps. cvi. 32 f.: "They made (God) angry at the water of strife, and it went ill with Moses because of them; for they made his spirit bitter, so that he spoke inconsiderate words with his lips" (וַיְבַטֵּא בִשְׂפָתָיו). It is an old question of dispute, "*qua in re peccaverit Moses.*" Comp. Buddeus, *Historia ecclesiastica V. T.* i. p. 527 f., for the older views. The recent critics have often maintained that there is at least one contradiction between the passages in the book of Numbers and those in Deuteronomy, but the solution is easily found in the way indicated in the text. That in the unbelief of the whole race no excuse is found for the weak faith of the chosen instruments of God; that unbroken obedience was demanded from the organs of revelation, and that these are most sharply punished as a warning,—is the idea of the narrative.

(2) Numerous mistakes have been made by taking the brazen serpent, Num. xxi. 8 f., as a symbol of the *healing power*, which the serpent certainly often is in heathenism; while besides this, in the Phœnician and Egyptian religions, the wounded serpent appears as a *symbol of eternity and immortality*. But this does not apply here. Though Wisd. xvi. 5 ff. calls the brazen שָׂרָף, *σύμβολον σωτηρίας*, this is not as if the serpent itself, as in heathenism, were the symbol of the healing power; but (comp. Schmid, *Biblical Theol. of the N. T.* i. p. 215; Ewald, *History of Israel*, ii. p. 176 f.), as indicated in the text, the matter stands thus:—The serpent is a symbol of the evil which has now come upon Israel on account of its sins, and the serpent set up as a standard is a symbol of the overcoming and doing away of evil for every believer by means of Jehovah's might and grace. "Now he who looks on this sign ordained by God is master of the

poison that has penetrated into him" (Baumgarten, *Theological Commentary on the Pentateuch*, i. 2). To this refers the typical interpretation in Christ's saying, John iii. 14 f.: *καθὼς Μωυσῆς ὕψωσε τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.* Therein lies the thought, that he who looks in faith to Him whom God, as Paul expresses it, 2 Cor. v. 21, has made to be sin for us, thus becomes free from the poison and guilt of sin which has entered into him.—A connection with the Egyptian serpent-worship is the less to be thought of in the story, since, according to Herodotus, ii. 74, the sacred serpents of the Egyptians were harmless. But Phœnician and Egyptian serpent-worship may very well have become at a later time the occasion of the idolatrous misuse of the image of the serpent which is spoken of in 2 Kings xviii. 4. [Baudissin i. p. 288 f., accepts the meaning given in the text to the setting up of the serpent, but remarks: "That the facts connected with the serpent were as related in the book of Numbers is hardly credible: for it remains . . unintelligible why Moses . . should have set up just an image of a serpent." But what other image should he have set up, if the object was to symbolize the destruction of noxious serpents? And if, as Baudissin further says, "it occurred" to Israelites at a later period, who met with the figure of a serpent, "to suppose a plague of serpents as the occasion for the making of the image, how can it be regarded as unintelligible that Moses at an actual plague of serpents should have actually made an image of a serpent? Moreover, according to the narrative, Moses made the serpent in accordance with the divine direction, and on this rests the significance of the story. But it is the way of our modern so-called "historians" to regard such divine directions as mythical adornment and simply to ignore the biblical statements.]

(3) Num. xxiv. 17–19 is the well-known prophetic passage concerning the star and sceptre arising out of Israel. It portrays the splendid and victorious power proceeding from Israel, which shall overcome Moab and Edom. We may admit that in the first instance only a *sovereignty* arising out of Jacob is here spoken of (as also Hengstenberg thinks). But this cannot, nevertheless, be conceived of without a personal representative of the sovereignty. The passage is certainly a Messianic one. I understand vers. 20–24 thus: The ancient people of Amalek shall not be protected by their *age*, nor the people of the Kenites by the *security* of their dwelling. The seer, after he has foretold the fall of Israel's chief enemies, means to say that each and every heathen people, even those who appear to be most firmly established, must perish. They fall, in the first instance, a sacrifice to the Asiatic world-power, which has its seat on the farther side of the Euphrates; but this power itself is overcome by a power coming from the side of the Hittites, that is, from the west, from the Mediterranean Sea. Since this also is doomed to destruction, the whole heathen world becomes before the eyes of the seer a great Golgotha, over which God's people victoriously rises. It is a perfectly miserable explanation, which is fond of calling itself historical (Hitzig), according to which the arrival of the fleet from the side of the Hittites is made to refer to an unimportant inroad of sea-robbers on the Asiatic coast in the eighth century. The passage is rather parallel to that in the close of Gen. ix. Here also the course of history is depicted in grand outlines: first, Asia, represented by Asshur, arises as a world-empire; Asia falls before a European power, and Israel rises out of both.

§ 31.

Deuteronomy. Death of Moses. His Position among the Organs of Revelation.

The people's wandering is completed, and Moses is to place the staff of leadership in Joshua's hands. The last testament of the departing leader to his people is given in Deuteronomy (1). In its legislative sections it forms the proper lawbook of the people, the enactments of which presuppose at the same time the settle-

ment of the people in the Holy Land. An essential peculiarity of the book is, that it also presents the subjective side of the law, which had been brought forward in the earlier books in strict objectivity; wherefore the tone of speech is here more that of paternal warning, which, by pointing to Jehovah's electing and long-suffering patient love, endeavors to awaken love to Him in return. In the section which carries out further the thoughts in Lev. xxvi. (Deut. xxviii.–xxx. comp. with chap. iv.), and in the farewell song of Moses, chap. xxxii., lie the fundamental conceptions of prophecy: God's grace and faithfulness in choosing and leading Israel; the people's thanklessness and rebelliousness; the divine judgment breaking in, and God's pity turning again to the people after the judgment, and bringing the counsel of salvation to its goal in their restoration. In Moses' blessing, chap. xxxiii., Judah, Levi, and Joseph are especially prominent; Simeon is not mentioned, which may be explained from what is noted at the close of § 30. In Josh. xix. the tribe appears again, but receives a very small inheritance. When Moses has finished blessing his people, he mounts to the top of Pisgah in order to cast yet one look on the longed-for land, and appears no more on earth. His end is related in a mysterious way, but is indicated, Deut. xxxiv. 5, 7, comp. xxxii. 50, by the same expressions as the common end of man's life (2). Standing in the same line with other organs of revelation by the name, prophet, Deut. xviii. 18, Hos. xii. 14, and the name of honor, "Jehovah's servant," Deut. xxxiv. 5, he was nevertheless placed above them, in that to him was granted (Ex. xxxiii. 11; Num. xii. 6–8; Deut. xxxiv. 10) a higher form of revelation than to the others, which is called a gazing upon God (comp. § 66, 3). His position, as divinely ordained to exercise all the powers of the theocracy, is a unique one, which did not descend to Joshua, who had only to execute inherited commands, and administer a law already given (3).

(1) Deuteronomy is one of the most disputed books in the Old Testament, but it is one of the most beautiful. To be sure, it does not place at its commencement a testimony that the book as it lies before us was written entirely by Moses; for בֵּאֵר, i. 5, does not mean "he engraved, wrote," but "he explained, expounded this law." This word, therefore, might have been used, even although the reporter of the speeches of Moses was another than Moses himself. But "this law" itself (הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת), under which is to be understood in particular the main legislative portion of the book, which is supplied with a special title, iv. 44–49, and with a subscription, xxviii. 69 (Heb.), is characterized most definitely as written by Moses by xxxi. 9 ("and Moses wrote this law"), and ver. 24("when Moses had finished writing the words of this law in a book to the end"); and it is also, without doubt, the legislation herein contained which was to be written, xxvii. 3–8, on the stones to be erected on Ebal. It is pure caprice to refer xxxi. 9, 24 to the *Pentateuch*, and yet to maintain that xxvii. 3–8, in spite of the most definite explanation in ver. 8, "all the words of this law," only speaks of a quintessence of the law, since even Hengstenberg and Keil have not ventured to assert the whole Pentateuch to have been written on those stones.—Now those legislative parts of Deuteronomy confessedly show a remarkable agreement with the book of the covenant in Exodus, which *claims to be* written by Moses.—The view of many modern critics, that the finding of the book of the law at the repairing of the temple under Josiah, in the year 624 B.C. (2 Kings xxii.), was in truth the publication of Deuteronomy, which was only written a short time before, is contrary to the fact that *even the oldest prophets* presuppose Deuteronomy, its legislative provisions, and also its speeches; though, indeed,

many modern critics turn the matter round, and say, for example, that Isa. i. does not rest on Deuteronomy, but Deuteronomy has copied Isa. i., etc.—A closer examination of the critical question of Deuteronomy must be left to Old Testament Introduction.

(2) In speaking of the close of Moses' life, the phrases, "to die," and "to be gathered to his people," are used xxxiv. 5, 7, xxxii. 50. The last expression denotes in the Old Testament common death and removal into Sheol, the kingdom of the dead (comp. § 78). There are two men in the Old Testament of whom these expressions are not used, viz. Enoch and Elijah. The Jewish legends sought to give Moses, that eminent organ of revelation, a place beside these two persons. Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8, § 48, represents him as suddenly snatched away as Elijah was, and adds that Moses has indeed written in the sacred books that he died, for fear that it might be said afterward, on account of his superabundant virtue, that he was gone to the Divinity; and Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. § 39, says he was buried, *μηδενὸς παρόντος, δηλονότι χερσὶν οὐ θνηταῖς, ἀλλ' ἀθανάτοις δυνάμεσιν.* The Rabbins sought to read something strange into Deut. xxxiv. 5, and explained the עַל־פִּי : "Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, at the *mouth of Jehovah.*" From this arose the Rabbinical doctrine of the death by a kiss; the *mors osculi*, which implies deliverance from death. It means rather: "according to the mouth of the Lord," according to the divine word or command. The expression refers to the earlier divine declaration, that Moses should not be allowed to see the promised land, but should die before that time. The position of the New Testament to the death of Moses is peculiar. While Heb. xi. 40 says of the Old Covenant fathers, that they "are not perfected without us," making their *τελείωσις* dependent on the completion of the New Testament work of redemption; the New Testament history of the transfiguration, where Moses appears with Elijah, Matt. xvii. 3, Luke ix. 30 f. (in which latter passage the *ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ*, is particularly significant), presupposes Moses as perfected for the heavenly life. If justice is done to all the passages, we must say, with Stier (*Words of the Lord Jesus*, in Matt. xvii.): "A wonderful exception is made with the bodies of these two from the common lot of death; although the lawgiver actually died on account of sin, and the prophet was already more nearly raised to the victory over death."—The passage Jude 9 refers to a legend which, according to Origen, *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, iii. 2, is taken from the apocryphal *Ascensio Mosis*, and has also found its way into the Targum of Jonathan in Deut. xxxiv. 6. According to it, Satan, referring to the murder of the Egyptian, Ex. ii. 12, is said to have withstood the archangel Michael, to whom the burial of Moses was given in charge by God.—The Jewish fables on the life and death of Moses are collected in the Rabbinical treatise "de Vita Mosis," translated into Latin by Gilbert Gaulmyn, and republished by Gfrörer, in the work, *Prophetæ veteres pseudepigraphi*, 1840, p. 303 ff.

(3) The unique importance of Moses is especially seen when we compare the position of Joshua with that of Moses. Joshua is simply a leader, he has no other theocratic power; in particular, he never performs priestly functions, and is subordinate in rank to the high priest. In the latter connection, Cassel (on Judg. i. 1, in Lange's *Commentary*) has well remarked, that Moses is always named *before* Aaron, but when Joshua is named along with the priest Eleazar, the name of the priest always stands first (comp. Num. xxxiv. 17, Josh. xiv. 1, xvii. 4, xix. 51, xxi. 1).

III. THE SETTLEMENT OF ISRAEL IN THE HOLY LAND.

§ 32.

Occupation of Canaan. Extermination of the Canaanites.

After Joshua had been confirmed in his office of leader by Jehovah (Josh. i. 1–9), the *passage of the Jordan* ensued in a miraculous way, as a pledge to the people that the same mighty God who was with Moses would reveal Himself also under the new leader (iv. 14, 22–24), and therefore this event is expressly placed side by side with the march through the Red Sea (iv. 23; Ps. cxiv. 3 ff.). The people encamped in the plain of *Jericho* (Josh. iv. 13), and here first the circumcision of those born during the march through the wilderness was completed, and the people entered on the enjoyment of the good things of the Holy Land with the first passover festival (v. 2–12). The key to the land was won by the conquest of Jericho (chap. vi.); on this followed, after the curse was expiated which came on the people by Achan's disobedience (chap. vii.; comp. Hos. ii. 17) (1), the taking of *Ai*, the second fortified place of central Canaan (Josh. viii.). The promulgation of the law from Gerizim and Ebal, ordained in Deut. xxvii. could now take place (viii. 30–35); and in accordance with the command in Deut. xxvii. 4–8, the law was written on stones plastered with lime (2). By a new victorious campaign against the southern (chap. x.), and another against the northern tribes of Canaan, the conquest of the land in a general sense was completed. The חֵרֶם (ban, devotion as a curse), enjoined in Deut. vii. 2, xx. 16–18, comp. Ex. xxiii. 32 f., xxxiv., 12 ff., was executed on a number of Canaanitish towns. The attempt had been made, but in vain, to interpret in a milder form this command to exterminate the Canaanites, by supposing that peace was first to be offered to the Canaanite towns, and if they refused this offer they were to be exterminated; but in Deut. xx. 10 ff., to which passage this view appeals, this course of action (comp. ver. 15) is only prescribed in reference to foreign enemies not Canaanites. Or we are referred to Josh. xi. 20, according to which the Canaanites themselves, by hardening their hearts, incurred the execution of the judgment—a perfectly correct proposition, but one which does not prevent us from understanding the decree of extermination in an unqualified sense. It is no less erroneous to seek to justify the extermination of the Canaanites by an older claim to Canaan, inherited by Israel from the time of the patriarchs. Passages like Gen. xii. 6, xiii. 7, oppose this in the most definite manner. The Old Testament knows no other ground for the assignment of the land to Israel than the free grace of Jehovah, to whom it belonged; and no other ground for the blotting out of the Canaanite tribes than the divine justice, which, after these tribes have filled up the measure of their sins in unnatural abominations (comp. Lev. xviii. 27 f., Deut. xii. 31), breaks in at last in vengeance, after long waiting (comp. Gen. xv. 16). But Israel is threatened with exactly the same judgment (comp. also Deut. viii. 19 f., xiii. 12 ff., Josh. xxiii. 15 f.) if it become guilty of the sins of the tribes on whom it executes the divine judgment with the sword.

(1) On Hos. ii. 17.—After it has been said in ver. 16 that God, in the future restoration of His people, will lead them into the wilderness and speak to their hearts (comp. § 28, note 1), the prophet goes on to say, "and I will give her her vineyards from thence"—that is, immediately on her leaving the wilderness, ensues the introduction to the promised land, with its vine-clad hills,—"and the valley of Achor for the door of hope." This points back to the narrative in Josh. vii. Jericho had fallen, and all seemed prosperous for Israel. There a part of the army was defeated by the inhabitants of Ai. It was revealed to Joshua that a curse was on the army; for Achan had kept to himself something from the booty of Jericho, contrary to the strict command of God. Then Joshua said to Achan: "As thou hast troubled us, so let Jehovah trouble thee to-day;" and from this comes the name of the valley of עֵמֶק עָכוֹר. Achan was stoned, and thereby the curse taken from the people; Ai was conquered, and thus the key to the land was won. So the valley of sorrow became the gate of hope. It is easy to recognize the prophet's meaning: when God redeems His people, everything must work for its good.

(2) On Josh. viii. 30–35; Deut. xxvii. 4–8.—Here, if anywhere, it is a true saying, that against many assumptions of the recent criticism the very stones cry out. Nowhere in classical literature is there such an example of recklessness as that which relegates the whole history of the transaction at Gerizim and Ebal without more ado to the sphere of myths. The Egyptian monuments show that it was an ancient Egyptian custom first to plaster the stone walls of buildings, and also monumental stones that were to be painted with figures and hieroglyphics, with a plaster of lime and gypsum, into which the figures were then worked; thus it was possible in Egypt to engrave on the walls the most extended inscriptions. In this manner Deut. xxvii. 4–8 must be understood, and in this manner it was accomplished by Joshua. It is not to be explained, as formerly was often done, by saying that the law was engraved on the stones, and then the lime was to serve either to make the writing stand out more clearly, or to protect it against the weather. If this were so, it is not conceivable that a law of any great extent could have been transcribed upon these stones. That we are not here to think of the whole Pentateuch, compare § 16, note.

(3) The extermination of the Canaanites has, as is well known, been a very special topic of discussion, and has been defended in many cases on very doubtful grounds. Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 387–417, has treated the matter best. At the first glance, the attempt seems most plausible which seeks to render the extermination of the Canaanites somewhat less inhuman, by pointing to an old claim of Israel on Palestine. But this is out of the question, if we look at the passages of the Old Testament in which the relation of the people to the land allotted to them is brought into closer view. It is true that Deut. xxxii. 8 contains the thought, that when different regions were allotted to the nations of the earth by Divine Providence, regard was had to the place where in later ages the people of revelation were to have their historical development (comp. § 22, note 1). But how did they get this place? In Genesis the distinct impression is conveyed that the ancestors of the nation were strangers in Canaan. For this reason, in Gen. xii. 6 and xiii. 7 it is expressly stated that at that time, the Canaanites and Perizzites were already in the land. Stephen, Acts vii. 5, declares the same thing with the greatest emphasis: "He gave him no inheritance in it, not even a foot-breadth, and promised that He would give it him," etc. The view presented above is alone in accordance with the Old Testament. Now it is certainly true that this Old Testament God is a dreadful God, as we are repeatedly told. But we are to remember that the God who rules in the history of the universe is in fact this same dreadful God. It is undeniable, that many nations have been swept away, and have experienced a like fate. Who has ordained this? The difference between the view of the Old Testament and of other histories lies simply in this, that where the latter perhaps see nothing but tragical crises of history, the former emphasizes the moral element, according to which nothing occurs without reason, and this reason lies in

the divine justice. It is quite unnecessary to add to this any artificial apologetical considerations. [Comp. the remarks of Prof. George P. Fisher in the *North American Review*, 1882.]

§ 33.

Division of the Land. Character of the Promised Land. Israel at the Close of this Period.

As the power of the Canaanites in general was broken, the Israelites now, in the seventh year after their entrance, as is to be concluded from Josh. xiv. 10, began *the division of the land*, although it was not yet in all parts completely vanquished (s. xiii. 2 ff.) (1). Eleazar the priest, and Joshua, with the chiefs of the tribes, managed the business of division (2). First, the most powerful tribes were provided for: *Judah* receiving the southern portion of the land; *Joseph*, that is, Ephraim and the other half of Manasseh, being settled in the middle. But a mistake had been made in the first calculation, so that afterwards, in the assignment of territory to the seven remaining tribes, Benjamin, Dan, and Simeon had to be put into land already apportioned. The sanctuary was removed from Gilgal to *Shiloh* (xviii. 1), which is situated pretty nearly in the middle of the land on this side Jordan, in the territory of the tribe of Ephraim, to which Joshua himself belonged, and there it remained till toward the end of the time of the judges (3). The division of the land was carried out, so that not merely the limits of the tribal territories were fixed, but inside these also the districts of the families (4). Thus the life of tribe and family remained the basis of civil society. This certainly fostered a disposition to maintain the interests of the tribes at the cost of the national cause, in times when there was no powerful central authority, and every one did what seemed right to him; but it also insured the propagation of the faith and customs of the fathers within the family circle (5), when declensions began to grow frequent.—Thus the "good land" (Ex. iii. 8; Deut. iii. 25, viii. 7–9), "the ornament of all lands" (Ezek. xx. 6, comp. with Jer. iii. 19, Dan. viii. 9, xi. 16), was won, where, on the basis of a life of husbandry requiring regular industry, the people were to be matured for the fulfilment of their destiny in quiet and retirement (Num. xxiii. 9; Deut. xxxiii. 28; comp. with Mic. vii. 14). The *separation from other peoples* commanded in the law (see specially Lev. xx. 24, 26) was made easier by the secluded position of the land, which was inclosed on the south and west by great wildernesses, on the north by the high mountains of Lebanon, and which even on the west was unfavorably situated for maritime intercourse, since the coast has few landing-places or inlets. On the other hand, by the situation of the land *in the midst of the cultivated nations* which figure in ancient history (comp. Ezek. v. 5, xxxviii. 12), as well as by means of the great highways of the old world which led past its borders, the future theocratic calling of the people was made possible (6). "This union of the greatest contrasts in respect to local position, viz., the utmost isolation and retirement, combined with everything to favor wide connections on all sides with the chief civilized regions of the old world by commercial intercourse and language, by sea as well as by land, with the Arabians, Indians, Egyptians, Syrians, Armenians, and with the Greek and Roman world of culture, in their common centre, local

and historical, is a characteristic peculiarity of this promised land which was destined from the beginning to be the home of the chosen people" (Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. 1, p. 11). Two parts of the promise given to the patriarchs were fulfilled—the entrance of Israel into their rest in the promised land, and the increase of the people like the stars of heaven (Deut. x. 22). But the dominion over the nations (Gen. xxvii. 29, xlix. 10) was not yet obtained, the blessing of Abraham was not yet come to the heathen ; nay, a new cycle of history must arise, in which centuries of contest for mere existence were ordained for the people.—Since the possession of the land was always in danger from the numerous remnants of the Canaanites, a part of whom were dispersed, and a part not yet touched by the march of conquest, as well as from the Philistine Pentapolis (Josh. xiii. 2 f.), which had arisen in the low country on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and from the neighborhood of hostile peoples on the east, a faithful union of the tribes in firm connection with the theocratic centre became an urgent necessity. And at first, on the occasion related in Josh. xxii., the consciousness of the theocratic unity of the people showed itself still in full strength, and Joshua exerted himself at two gatherings of the people which he held toward the close of his life (chap. xxiii. and xxiv.) to reanimate this feeling, and to repress the idolatry that was springing up among them (xxiv. 23, comp. with ver. 15). The people too were willing to renew the covenant with Jehovah, and remained, on the whole, true to it as long as the race lived that had seen God's great deeds (xxiv. 31 ; Judg. ii. 7).

(1) One of the contradictions which are said to have been found in the book of Joshua is this : On the one hand the book ascribes the vanquishing of the Canaanites and the conquest of the land to Joshua (xi. 16–23, xii. 7 ff., comp. xxi. 41 ff., xxii. 4); and yet, on the other (chap. xiii.), an account of unconquered lands is given, and the necessity is expressed of making still more extensive conquests. The matter stands thus. When it is said, xi. 23, "So Joshua took the whole land," this means : the conquest of the land *in general* was finished. This does not exclude the fact that in detail, as is explained in chap. xiii., there was still very much to be done. That the conquest was looked upon as on the whole complete, is shown in the second part of the book (chap. xiii.–xxii.), by the fact that he caused the parts which were not conquered to be divided.—The *second part of the book* is of immense value for *biblical geography*. If we compare these sections with the parallel passages, 1 Chron. iv. 28–32, vi. 39–66, we see how difficult it would have been in a later time to write down and represent everything for the first time, as those must suppose who make the book much more modern.

(2) To aid in this assignment of territory, a sort of map had been sketched. I think Ritter is right in thus understanding Josh. xviii. 4–9 ; see his *History of Geography and Discovery*, edited by Daniel, p. 7 f., where we are reminded that the knowledge necessary for this might have been brought from Egypt, where land measurement was a very ancient thing, as the division of fields required to be newly adjusted each year after the overflow of the Nile.

(3) [The strong evidence from this passage for the existence of the tabernacle is rather summarily disposed of by the criticism of Wellhausen. He says it belongs to the priests' codex and connects it directly with xiv. 1–5, while xiv. 6 and xviii. 2–10 are assigned to the Jehovist (p. 365 f.): if it belonged to the priests' codex, it arose from the same deception as that whole legislation. He regards 1 Sam. ii. 22 b as certainly, and 1 K. viii. 4 as probably an interpolation (p. 45 f.); for the former passage is "poorly attested and its contents are suspicious."]

(4) Hence the regularly recurring לְמִשְׁפְּחוֹתָם in the charter of division, Josh. xviii. f.—The name אַלְפֵי (Mic. v. 1) was conferred metaphorically on the more notable towns which were the chief places of the tribes. From this we can understand how the towns themselves were then further personified and inserted in the tribal registers, in which local dependence is represented as genealogical descent (see specially 1 Chron. ii. 42 ff., and Bertheau on the passage, iv. 4 ff., etc.). Art. "Stämme Israels," in Herzog, 1st ed.

(5) Thus various callings readily became hereditary, and there were families which, according to 1 Chron. iv. 14, xxi. 23, formed themselves directly into trade guilds. Similarly, in 1 Chron. ii. 55, families of Sopherim (scribes) are mentioned. Also in the names, ii. 53, names of occupations are perhaps contained, as Jerome conjectured.

(6) One of these *old national roads*, the northern, led from Central Asia past Damascus to the Mediterranean Sea; the other in the south, by Idumea to Egypt (comp. the "Remarks on Gen. xiv." by Tuch in the *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, i. 1847, p. 161 ff.*).—A first consequence of the position of Israel in the midst of the nations was, that it courted the powers of the world, and was chastised by all, so that all became instruments of judgment on Israel. But on the other side, it was this central position which made this land fit for the starting-point of the religion of the world.

* Reprinted in the second edition of Tuch's *Genesis*.

SECOND SECTION.

THE DOCTRINES AND ORDINANCES OF MOSAISM.

§ 34.

Survey.

This section is divided as follows :

1. The doctrine of *God and His relation to the world,* which doctrine is to be treated so that it may appear how God's theocratic and revealed relation is rooted in the Mosaic idea of God.

2. The doctrine of *man and his relation to God,* which again is to be so exhibited that it may appear how the presupposition of the covenant relation in which God is to stand to him is given in the idea of man.

3. The *law covenant and the theocracy,* in which is completed the Mosaic stage of communion between God and man.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD AND HIS RELATION TO THE WORLD.

FIRST CHAPTER.

THE MOSAIC IDEA OF GOD.

§ 35.

Survey.

The fundamental points in the Mosaic idea of God are the following :

1. The *most general* names for the Divine Being are אֵל, אֱלוֹהַּ, אֱלֹהִים, אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, which are also made use of outside of the religion of the Old Testament.

2. The divine name אֵל שַׁדַּי is the first that leads into the sphere of revelation.

3. But the divine name which properly belongs to the Old Testament revelation is יהוה, Jehovah.

4. The idea of Jehovah was more exactly defined after the founding of the theocracy as that of the *holy* God, in which essential definition the attributes of divine justice and of the jealous God are rooted, as well as the attributes of the gracious (חַנּוּן) and merciful God (רַחוּם).

In these stages the idea of God is so unfolded that the higher stages do not destroy the lower, but embrace them (1).

(1) It is a mistake to bring the theological divisions of a later period into Biblical Theology, and to treat God's attributes according to a preconceived scheme. Biblical Theology traces the religion of revelation in its rise and development, and finds for the definition of the idea of God a gradually advancing series of statements concerning the divine essence. Genesis gives only the *general characteristics* of the divine nature under No. 1, the אֵל שַׁדַּי under No. 2, and the name Jehovah by anticipation. The divine essence conceived of as *Jehovah* unfolds itself from Ex. iii. onward, and at the founding of the theocracy the divine *holiness* first appears. We seek in vain through the whole of Genesis for a passage characterizing God as the Holy One. After the first breach of the covenant which called forth the divine קִנְאָה [jealousy], the energy of the divine sanctity, we find God described also for the first time as the *gracious*, *merciful*, *long-suffering*. The prophetic theology adds the definition of Jehovah as the *Lord of hosts*; this conception is wanting in the whole of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua (also in Judges). The designation of God as *wise* is also wanting in the Pentateuch, although certainly the wisdom of the artists who worked upon the sanctuary is traced back to divine communication. It was reserved for more developed reflection (especially in the books of the Hhokhma) to represent wisdom as an attribute of God, and to acknowledge in it the principle of the order of the world.

I. THE MOST GENERAL DESIGNATIONS OF THE DIVINE BEING, EL, ELOAH, ELOHIM, EL-ELYON (1).

§ 36.

The most common designation of the Divine Being in the Old Testament is אֱלֹהִים, the plural of אֱלוֹהַּ. The word in the singular occurs in the Old Testament almost exclusively in *poetical language*, with the exception of the later books composed under Aramaic influence. But אֵל is to be counted the *oldest* Semitic name of God. It appears in a number of the oldest names of men (Gen. iv. 18, מְחוּיָאֵל, מְתוּשָׁאֵל; and also in Ishmaelitish and Edomitish names, xxv. 13, אַדְבְּאֵל, a son of Ishmael; xxxvi. 43, מַגְדִּיאֵל). This name also passed to the Phœnicians as a name of Saturn, their highest god. As a name of the true God, אֵל is not frequent in the prose of the Old Testament. It hardly ever appears except with the article הָאֵל, or in connection with a following genitive, or an attribute annexed in some other way. That אֵל stands lower than אֱלֹהִים is seen by the climactic formula Josh. xxii. 22, (Ps. l. 1). The meaning of the root אול (to be strong, powerful) shows that the original sense of אֵל is "the powerful, strong."—Two different views exist as to the etymological explanation of אֱלוֹהַּ. According to the one, אֵל and אֱלוֹהַּ are to be regarded as cognate primitive substantives, whose original sense, as shown by the verb אוּל, is that of *power* (2). According to this, the verb אָלַה (Arab. *aliha*) is a denominative. According to the other view,

אֵל and אֱלוֹהַּ are etymologically distinct, and the latter is to be derived from the root *aliha*, which means *stupuit, pavore perculsus fuit* (as also restless, disconnected movement lies in the related root *waliha*,) in distinction from *alaha*, to honor, the denominative character of which is not to be doubted (3). אֱלוֹהַּ, as an abstract verbal noun, would originally denote *terror*, and then further the object of terror, and thus corresponds with the divine name פַּחַד (Gen. xxxi. 42, 53), and the Greek *σέβας*. The latter view is probably the more correct, since at least the noun אֱלוֹהַּ has not the character of a primitive. If power or might are indicated by the noun אֵל, this idea is, on the other hand, only subjectively given in the name אֱלוֹהַּ, which expresses the *impression* made by power. Eloah is, according to this, the power which awakens *terror*. That the natural man finds himself, when confronted by the Divinity, chiefly moved by a feeling of fear, is expressed in this designation of God (4).

The *plural* אֱלֹהִים is peculiar to the Old Testament; it appears as a name of God only in old Hebrew, and in none of the other Semitic languages; even in the biblical Chaldee, אֱלָהִין only means gods. The meaning of this plural is not numerical, either in the sense in which some older theologians understand it, who seek the mystery of the *Trinity* in the name (5), or in the sense that the expression had originally a *polytheistic* meaning, and only at a later period acquired a singular sense (6); for the Old Testament monotheism was not developed on a polytheistic basis (comp. § 43, 1).—A third view, that originally the plural included the one God together with the higher spirits around Him has against it the general argument, that in those ancient times the idea of angels is not prominent. This view cannot be sustained by appealing to Gen. i. 26 ("Let us make man"), since the whole of this record of creation shows no trace of a co-operation of the angels, and ver. 27 continues in the singular (7). It would be more natural to interpret Gen. xxxv. 7 ("The Elohim revealed themselves to him") as indicating that the plural includes Jehovah together with the angels, in accordance with the vision (chap. xxviii.) (8).—It is much better to explain Elohim as the *quantitative plural* (9), which is used to denote unlimited greatness in שָׁמַיִם, heaven, and מַיִם, water. The plural signifies the *infinite fulness* of the might and power which lies in the Divine Being, and thus passes over into the *intensive plural*, as Delitzsch has named it. So far, the old view of a plural of majesty was right; but it was incorrect to derive this use from the *consuetudo honoris* (10).—The plural contained in אֲדֹנָי is to be explained in the same way; indeed, this plural of majesty has also passed to other titles of God: קְדוֹשִׁים, Hos. xii. 1, Prov. ix. 10, to which the expression אֱלֹהִים קְדוֹשִׁים, Josh. xxiv. 19, forms the transition; comp. further the עֹשִׂים in Isa. liv. 5, Job xxxv. 10, and the בֹּרְאִים in Eccles. xii. 1; also the passage Gen. i. 26 is to be explained thus.

Now, since the fulness of might lying in the divine nature is expressed quite generally in אֱלֹהִים, a certain indefiniteness clings to the word, as to the Latin *numen* (11). The expression in its indefinite breadth does not exclude the more concrete determinations of the idea of God; it remains all through the Old Testament the general name of God; in fact, it is used with special emphasis in the Elohistic psalms. But on account of the uncertainty of its meaning, אֱלֹהִים can also be used to designate heathen gods; indeed, it is once used (1 Sam.

xxviii. 13, in the mouth of the enchantress) to designate a supernatural manifestation exciting terror.

As a name of the *true* God, אֱלֹהִים is regularly *joined with the singular*. The exceptions are rare, and explicable from the context of the passages. In Gen. xx. 13 a heathen is addressed ; in Ex. xxxii. 4, 8, 1 Sam. iv. 8, 1 Kings xii. 28, the God of Israel is spoken of from the lower standpoint of heathen conceptions ; and in 2 Sam. vii. 23 the general notion of Deity lies in the plural אֱלֹהִים (12).

The divine name אֵל עֶלְיוֹן (LXX. *ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὑψιστος*), or simply עֶלְיוֹן (LXX. *ὑψιστος*), is also used outside of the sphere of revelation. The name appears as a designation of God, the Lord of heaven and earth, in the mouth of Melchizedek, the Canaanite priest-king (Gen. xiv. 18) ; it is the name of the highest god, Saturn, in the Phœnician religion, and even serves in the Pœnulus of Plautus as a title of the gods and goddesses. It is characteristic that it appears also in the mouth of the king of Babylon (Isa. xiv. 14), probably to designate Bel. The Old Testament makes use of the name from the Israelitish standpoint only in poetry (Num. xxiv. 16, etc. ; Deut. xxxii. 8 ; Ps. lvii. 3, etc.), sometimes in conjunction with יְהוָה. It is remarkable that the book of Daniel uses עֶלְיוֹן in the plural of majesty with a Hebrew plural termination (Dan. vii. 18, 22, 25) in a Chaldee section, while the Chaldee plural of majesty, אֱלָהִין, does not occur.

(1) Compare my article "Elohim" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xix. p. 476 ff., and the article by Delitzsch, 2d ed. iv. 186 ff.

(2) See Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, i. p. 49 ; Ewald, *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissenschaft*, x. p. 11.—Ewald sees an abbreviation of אֱלוֹהַּ in אֵל, and maintains that the former, as shown by the similar form of both words, is the antithesis of אֱנוֹשׁ, in which God is designated as the absolutely powerful in contrast to man, the absolutely weak. Comp. also Ewald's *History of the People of Israel*, i. p. 264 [and *Lehre v. Gott*, ii. 228, f.].

(3) See the argument at large by Fleischer in Delitzsch's *Comment. on Genesis*, 4th ed. p. 57 f.

(4) If the Epicureans say, *timor fecit Deos*, the converse may be put thus : The emotion called forth by the thought of God in the human mind is that of fear, of terror ; and this is characteristic of the primitive form of religion among sinful men.

(5) See the historical notices on the trinitarian interpretation in the above-cited art., p. 477. This view no longer requires refutation ; still we may say, with Hengstenberg (*Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, i. p. 273), that even this erroneous view has some truth at its foundation, since the plural form, indicating the inexhaustible fulness of the Divinity, serves to combat the most dangerous enemy of the doctrine of the Trinity, viz. abstract Monotheism [above-cited art.].

(6) The word תְּרָפִים is adduced as an analogous example (comp. Nägelsbach, *Hebrew Grammar*, 3d ed. p. 140 f.), which appears in the Old Testament, as is well known, in speaking of a single household god [*ibid.*]. [The theory of the originally polytheistic meaning of the plural has recently been maintained by Baudissen, i. 55 ff. and Schultz, 124 f., 479 f., although both admit that in the Old Testament, except when applied to non-Israelitish gods, it is always used as a singular. They believe that the origin of the plural name for the *one* God can hardly be explained except on the supposition that a previous plurality of God came to be comprehended in the one God. But admitting, as these scholars do, that this plural expressed, in the conception of the men of the Old Testament, the plenitude of power in the one God of Israel (so also Gesenius), why should it

be inconceivable that the endeavor to express this plenitude of power of the one God gave rise to this plural form? And if the remark of Schultz, p. 479, is correct, that the singular form, *Eloah*, is clearly in its whole use an artificial and poetical word, and not the ground form in the language of the nation, and if consequently the plural existed before the singular, every reason for holding that it originally expressed a plurality of single beings falls to the ground.]

(7) From this would flow the quite insignificant thought that God at first called out the angels to take part in the creation of man, but completed the work alone, according to ver. 27 (comp. § 43, and Keil on the passage) [*ibid.*].

(8) [This view has been again advanced on partially new grounds by P. Wurm, "The Divine Name, Elohim, and the relation of God and Angels in the Old Testament," in the *Theol. Studien aus Württemberg*, 1881. Starting with Fleischer's etymology, he explains Elohim as "*manifestation* from the higher, invisible world, which awakens terror in man," as "a superior being, who reveals himself to man." In that case, certainly the word would be applicable to angels as well as to God. But are the Aramaic אֱלָהִין also beings who reveal themselves, or can it be shown that this name first came through Hebrew influence into the Aramaic language?]

(9) The credit of having pointed out this correct view of the plural Elohim belongs to Dietrich (*Abhandlungen zur hebr. Gramm.* 1846, p. 44 ff., comp. with p. 16 ff.).

(10) Akin to the *quantitative* use of the plural is that of the plural of *abstraction*, in which a plurality is grasped in a higher unity; comp. examples in Ewald's *Larger Grammar of the Hebrew Language*, 8th ed. § 179. But it is hardly correct to understand the plural Elohim as exactly an abstract word, as Hofmann does (*Schriftbeweis*, i. 2d ed. p. 77). The abstract form of expression for names of dignity (for example קְהִלַּת), which often appears in Aramaic (see Ewald, *l.c.* § 177 f.), seems to be rather the product of a later phase of the language, which must not be confounded with the archaic use of the plural discussed above.

(11) Yet we cannot say, with Hengstenberg (*Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, i. p. 273), that the plural Elohim also expresses a lower idea. Steudel says more correctly (*Theol. of the Old Testament*, p. 143), that there is in the name something that can be developed.

(12) The meaning of the passage 2 Sam. vii. 23 is: "Where is there a people on the earth to save whom a god (even one of the heathen gods) has gone?" hence אֲשֶׁר הָלְכוּ (*ibid.*).—On Ex. xxii. 8, comp. § 98.—After what has been remarked above, it would not be surprising if the name אֱלֹהִים should be used for the angels, who as θείας φύσεως κοινωνοί are often called *sons of God*. Still this use of the word can nowhere be shown; certainly not in Ps. viii. 6, xcvii. 7, cxxxviii. 1, where the LXX. have translated it by ἄγγελοι; also not in Ps. lxxxii., where, in spite of Hupfeld's assertion to the contrary, אֱלֹהִים does not designate angels, but the bearers of the judicial power in the theocracy [*ibid.*].

II. EL-SHADDAI.

§ 37.

The definition of God enters the sphere of revelation in the name אֵל שַׁדַּי, which is peculiar to the patriarchal religion; see Ex. vi. 3. The word שַׁדַּי should not be understood as a compound word (from שֶׁ = אֲשֶׁר and דַּי, *qui sufficiens est*, as designating the divine aseity) (1); but is to be traced back to the [monosyllabic] root שׁר, the fundamental meaning of which is "to be strong, to show oneself superior," from whence is formed, in the Arabic *shadda*, the meaning *ligavit*,

Conj. VIII. *vehemens fuit*, and in the Hebrew שׁדד, the meaning "to force, to lay waste," whence the play of words in Joel i. 15, Isa. xiii. 6 (כְּשֹׁד מִשַּׁדִּי יָבוֹא). Accordingly, the name is either to be derived from a stem שׁדה, with Ewald (*Ausf. Lehrb.* 8th ed. § 155, *c*), according to which it would be an intensive form like קַטָּל, or, what is more probable, from the stem שׁדד with the formative syllable ־ִי, which occurs also in other proper names (as חַנִּי, זַכַּי). It is quite incorrect to understand ־ִי as a suffix-form of the first person plural, as in אֲדֹנָי; for while the latter occurs in the older language only in addressing God, God *Himself* says, Gen. xvii. 1, xxxv. 11, "I am El-shaddai" (2). The name characterizes God as *revealing Himself in His might;* the LXX. do not understand the expression in the Pentateuch, but it is correctly rendered by *παντοκράτωρ* in most passages of Job. It is no longer the powerful Divinity ruling in the world in general that is El-shaddai, but the God who testifies of Himself in *special deeds* of power, by which He subdues nature to the ways of His kingdom, making the childless Abraham the father of many nations (Gen. xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, comp. xxxv. 11), and who causes that race with which He has entered into covenant to experience His powerful presence in protection and blessing, Gen. xliii. 14, xlviii. 3, xlix. 25 (3). But as soon as the name *Jehovah* unfolds its meaning, the name El-shaddai falls back on the one hand into the list of the *more general names of God;* thus in Balaam's parable it appears, Num. xxiv. 4, 16, in the same line with אֵל and עֶלְיוֹן; in the book of Job, in the same line with אֵל and אֱלוֹהַּ. But, on the other hand, it is still used at times *alternately with the name Jehovah* where God's omnipotence is made prominent in contrast with human weakness, as in the beautiful passage Ruth i. 20 f., or in speaking of the revelation of God's overpowering judgments, Joel i. 15, Isa. xiii. 6, Ps. lxviii. 15, Ezek. x. 5; also in speaking of the Omnipotent Protector of His people, Ps. xci. 1, etc.

The word שֵׁדִים, which in Deut. xxxii. 17, Ps. cvi. 37, serves to designate the gods of the heathen, is scarcely connected with שַׁדַּי, as some suppose. It is probably not to be traced to שׁדד, as some earlier theologians wish, as if it denoted destructive beings, but is rather to be understood as a participle of שׁוד (Arabic *sâda*), *dominatus fuit*, according to which it means "Lords" or "Rulers."

(1) Thus for example Maimonides, *More Nebochim*, ed. Buxtorf, p. 144 ff., and Calvin.

(2) Deyling has protested against deriving שַׁדַּי from שׁדד, *Observationes sacræ*, i. p. 46 f.: "שׁדד noxiam potentiam, omniaque desolantem in scriptura denotat, et de *vastatione*, *per solos hostes facta*, non per pestem, aut grandinem, aut aquarum eluviones usurpatum reperitur.—Ergo nomen שדי a שׁדד deductum, ne *Deum* quidem deceret, sed Diabolum potius, qui nomen שֵׁד inde etiam revera sortitus est."—But here Deyling proceeds from the meaning "to lay waste," which we must regard as only *derivative*.

(3) On Gen. xvii. 1 Delitzsch says forcibly: "אלהים is the God who creates nature so that it is, and supports it so that it continues; אל שׁדי, the God who compels nature to do what is contrary to itself, and subdues it to bow and minister to grace."

III. THE NAME JEHOVAH (1).

§ 38.

1. *Pronunciation and Grammatical Explanation of the Name.*

The special name of God in the Old Testament is the tetragrammaton יהוה, which is hence characterized by the Jews as הַשֵּׁם [the name] *κ. ἐξ.* (comp. Lev. xxiv. 11, Deut. xxviii. 58), שֵׁם הַמְיֻחָד רַבָּא שְׁמָא the great name, *nomen unicum*, the unique name, but in particular as שֵׁם הַמְפֹרָשׁ, which latter expression, however, is itself interpreted in different ways (2).

The word יהוה in the Masoretic text of the Old Testament has in virtue of a K'ri *perpetuum*, the vowel pointing of אֲדֹנָי (3). Where אֲדֹנָי already occurs in the connection of the sentence (as Isa. xxii. 12, 14, etc.), the pronunciation of אֱלֹהִים is substituted unless the two words standing beside each other belong to different clauses, as in Ps. xvi. 2.—The prohibition forbidding the *utterance of the name* is derived by the Jews from Lev. xxiv. 16, in virtue of an untenable exposition of the passage given in the LXX. (*ὀνομάζων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου*) (4). — *How old the dread of uttering the name* is, cannot be accurately fixed. The use of אֱלֹהִים [instead of יְהוָה] in a series of *psalms* is not to be derived from this. The dread in question sprang from the efforts of the later Judaism to thrust back the Divinity to an unapproachable distance, and everywhere to put something between the Divinity and man (as *e.g.*, where Jehovah in the Old Testament is brought into connection with the material world, His *word* is substituted for Himself). The name ceases to be prominent in some of the latest Old Testament writings, and is regularly rendered *κύριος* by the LXX. (so also in the New Testament) (5). Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 5. 5, tells us of the Samaritans, that the sanctuary which they founded in Gerizim was *ἀνώνυμον ἱερόν* [a temple without a name]. Josephus himself declares, *Ant.* ii. 12. 4, that he was not permitted to speak concerning the name. With this, Philo's assertion, *de mut. nom.* § 2 (ed. Mang. i. 580), and *vit. Mos.* iii. 25 (ii. 166), is to be compared ; yet it is remarked in the latter book, § 11, (152), that consecrated persons in the sanctuary were allowed to hear and to pronounce the name. According to the tradition in Maimonides, *More Neb.* i. 61, *Jad chazaka* xiv. 10, which agrees with *Thamid* vii. 2, the name in the early period of the second temple was still uttered in the sanctuary at the pronouncing of the blessing, and by the high priest on the day of atonement ; but after the death of Simon the Just, that is, after the first half of the third century B.C., it was exchanged there also for Adhonai, as had been long the practice outside the temple. The Jews maintain that the knowledge of the true pronunciation of the name has been entirely lost since the destruction of the temple. On the other hand, after the sixteenth century, it became more and more the custom among Christian theologians to pronounce the name *Jehovah* by reading the K'ri points with the consonants יהוה ; but this pronunciation was not used by Reuchlin (6). Some later theologians, as Joh. Friedr. v. Meyer, Stier, and in particular Hoelemann (in a treatise "On the Meaning and Pronunciation of יהוה," in his *Bibel-studien*, 1859), think they

are compelled to regard Jehovah as the correct pronunciation. According to this, the word would be formed, by a quite unparalleled construction, from יְ = יְהִי, הוֹ = הָוֶה, and וָ = הָוָה (comp. Stier, *Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache*, p. 327), and would comprehend the three tenses [future, present, and past]. This unprecedented etymology would correspond, it is claimed, with the uniqueness of the divine nature. In support of this view we are referred principally to the *ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος* in Rev. i. 4, iv. 8; but it is erroneous to seek an explanation of the word in this *paraphrase* of the meaning of the name (in fact, the succession of the tenses in the passages in the Apocalypse would not agree with the above explanation). Besides, *ἐρχόμενος* is decidedly not the same as *ἐσόμενος*; it simply means the *coming one;* (7) and therefore, as soon as the advent of the Lord has become present, Rev. xi. 17 (according to the true reading) and xvi. 5, *ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν* only is written (12). The abbreviation יְהוּ appearing at the end of many personal names (*e.g.* יִרְמְיָהוּ, אֶלְיְהוּ) cannot be satisfactorily explained on the reading Jehovah (Hoelemann's explanation is artificial), while the abbreviation יְהוֹ or יו at the beginning of names can be justified by the pronunciation to be mentioned below.

Ex. iii. 13–15 is the decisive passage for the pronunciation and grammatical explanation of the name. When Moses asks for the name of the God who sends him forth, He, God, says: אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, "Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, Ehyeh has sent me unto you." Now when it goes on to say, ver. 15, "Thus shalt thou say, יהוה, the God of your fathers, has sent me unto you," it is clear that the word יהוה is to be regarded as a noun formed from the third person of the imperfect of הָוָה (the older form of הָיָה), and we must read either יַהֲוֶה (יַהֲוֶה), or, what is also not impossible, since such forms do occur, יַהְוֶה (יַהֲוֶה). The first form is more probable (8). From the pronunciation Jahve we obtain the abbreviation יְהוּ (which is to be explained through apocope for יַהְוֶ), and by contraction from this, יְהוֹ or יו when it is placed at the beginning of the word. יָהּ followed from a still further abbreviation of יְהוּ; it appears first in the song of Moses, Ex. xv. 2, and afterward particularly in the הַלְלוּ יָהּ. All the testimony given by *tradition* concerning the pronunciation of Jahve is that, according to *Theodoret* (*quæst.* 15 *in Ex.*), the Samaritans pronounced the name Ἰαβέ (Theodoret ascribes to the Jews the pronunciation Ἀϊά, which might give evidence of the pronunciation Jahva); compare with this *Epiphanius*, *adv. hær.* i. 3. 20 (40) (*κατὰ Ἀρχοντικῶν*), who likewise reads Ἰαβέ. *Origen*, *c. Cels.*, gives the name as Ἰαωια (9). Side by side with this there are, to be sure, other accounts. According to *Diodorus*, i. 94, the Jews spoke the name Ἰαω; also Origen in the Commentary to John i. 1; and *Theodoret* (*quæst. in* 1 *Chron.*) mention this pronunciation. On the other hand, *Sanchoniathon*, in Eusebius, *Præp. ev.* i. 9, pronounces the name Ὑενώ; and Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* v. 6, Ἰαού [unless it would be more correct to read Ἰαουέ] (10). *Jerome* on Ps. viii. 2 says: *legi potest Jaho.* But a form יַהְוֹה would be quite contrary to the analogy of the Hebrew language (10). [On the pronunciation *Jeve* (of which traces have recently been found and which Joachim de Floris (thirteenth century) mentions as handed down by the Jews, comp. the communications of Stade and Delitzsch in Stade's *Zeitschrift für A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1881, p. 346, and 1882, p. 173.]

(1) Comp. my article "Jehovah" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* vi. p. 455 ff. [and the addition by Delitzsch in Herzog, 2d ed. also Schaff's Herzog, I. 1152 and art. "Jehovah" in Smith's Bible Dictionary, by W. Aldis Wright].

(2) The explanation of the expression *Shem-ham'phorash* is uncertain (Luther wrote a book on this designation). Comp. the remarks of Munk (on i. 61), in his edition of the *More Nebochim* of Maimonides (*Le guide des égarés par Mose ben Maimun*, Paris, 1856). Munk himself, referring to the use of פרש by Onkelos and Aben Esra on Lev. xxiv. 11, 16, decides in favor of the explanation: le nom de Dieu *distinctement prononcé*. The expression is generally explained: nomen *explicitum*, that is, either the name which is replaced by other names of God (s. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* p. 2433), or the name by which the nature of God is distinctly characterized. Others explain: nomen *separatum*, namely, either *sc.* a cognitione hominum, or what is best = the incommunicable name of God, which (comp. Maimonides, *l.c.*) instructs us concerning God's essence, while the other names express attributes which God has in common with others [above art.].

(3) The substitution of the simple Sh'wa instead of Hhateph-Pathahh is probably to be regarded as only an abbreviation in writing.

(4) The connection of Lev. xxiv. 16 is: one had blasphemed (נקֵב) the holy name of God, whereupon Moses receives the direction: "Bring the blasphemer outside the camp, and the whole community shall stone him. But thou shalt say to the sons of Israel, Whosoever curses his God shall bear his sin." The following words in ver. 16, וְנֹקֵב שֵׁם יְהוָה מוֹת יוּמָת, are explained by the Jewish exegesis: "He who *names* the name יְהוָה shall be put to death.—Even if נקב (root-meaning, to bore, to prick) might be taken as meaning *to pronounce*—but in the passages, Gen. xxx. 28, Num. i. 17, Isa. lxii. 2, advanced to prove this, it has rather the meaning, to *characterize*, *to define*—the connection with vers. 11 and 15 would still lead us to understand a blaspheming utterance. But probably the word is to be taken as exactly = קָבַב, comp. Num. xxiii. 8 [*ibid.*].—On the Rabbinical application of Ex. iii. 15 to the prohibition, see the above article, p. 455.

(5) Another expedient of the Jews was to place הַשֵּׁם [the name] instead of the name itself.

(6) According to Böttcher's account, in his *Ausf. Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, i. p. 49, the first trace of the pronunciation Jehovah was in the anti-Jewish book *Pugio fidei;* but he who gave it currency was Peter Galatinus, a friend of Reuchlin (*De arcanis cathol. veritatis*, ii. 10), from 1518 on. It is often used by Luther.

(7) See Hengstenberg i. p. 274 ff.—On the comparison of the Latin *Jupiter*, *Jovis*, cited in favor of the reading Jehovah (see Fuller in Reland, p. 448, Gataker, *ibid.* p. 494),—a comparison that overlooks the more complete forms, *Diespiter*, *Diovis*,—and further on the hypothesis according to which a supposed Egyptian name of God formed from the seven vowels *ιεηωουα*, is said to be preserved in the word Jehovah, see likewise Hengstenberg, *l.c.* p. 231 ff.; Tholuck, *Miscell. Writings*, i. p. 394 ff.

(8) The name יהוה, as third person, corresponds to אֶהְיֶה in Ex. iii. 11. The *a* sound under the preformative was in general, probably, the older form, as we still see in the Arabic.—The noun formation from the imperfect is very common in the Hebrew in appellatives (s. Delitzsch, *Jesurun*, p. 208 f.), but particularly in proper names (comp. יַעֲקֹב, יִשְׂרָאֵל, etc.). The names thus formed, corresponding to the fundamental meaning of the imperfect, characterize a person by a peculiarity which is continually manifested in him, and so is specially characteristic [*ibid.*]. The formation is perfectly analogous to the Latin ending *tor*, which is connected with *turus*.—Delitzsch, in his *Commentary on the Psalms* (1859 and 1860), reads Jahawah, but he has now given up this view.

(9) [According to Baudissin, "The divine name Ἰάω" (*Studien*, i. p. 181 ff.), in the passage cited: "*ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν γραφῶν τὸν Ἰαωὶὰ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ὀνομαζόμενον*," Ἰάω-Ἰὰ is to be separated and the rendering to be given: "from the Hebrew writings (they have, viz., the Ophites) the name Ἰάω, which is pronounced by the Hebrews Ἰὰ" (p. 183 f.)].

(10) [Comp. Baudissin. According to him the word Ἰάω cannot come into consideration in the decision upon the correct pronunciation of יהוה. The view of Movers, given as probable in the first edition of this work, that these forms of pronunciation are in imitation of the mystical name of Dionysos, Ἴακχος, for which the Semitic name was pronounced יָהוֹ, is, according to the investigations of Baudissin, not correct, since whenever Ἰάω occurs, it may be referred to the tetragram יהוה, and this, so far as our present knowledge extends, belongs exclusively to the people of Israel.]

§ 39.

2. *The Signification of the Name.*

The name signifies, *He who is*, according to Ex. iii. 14; more particularly, *He who is what He is* (1). But as it is not the idea of a *continuous existence* which lies in the verb הוה or היה, but that of *existence in motion*, of becoming and occurring (comp. Delitzsch, *Genesis*, 4th ed. p. 26), so also the form of the name as derived from the imperfect leads us to understand in it the existence of God, not as an existence at rest, but as one always becoming, always making itself known in a process of becoming. Hence it is wrong to find in the name the abstract notion of ὄντως ὄν. God is rather Jahve in as far as He has entered into an *historical* relation to mankind, and in particular to the chosen people Israel, and shows Himself continually in this historical relation as He who is, and who is what He is. While heathenism rests almost exclusively on the *past* revelations of its divinities, this name testifies, on the other hand, that the relation of God to the world is in a state of continual living activity; it testifies, especially in reference to the people who address their God by this name, that they have in their God a future. But more particularly the name Jehovah (2) expresses two ideas:

1. Inasmuch as God is just what He is, and so determines Himself in the historical manifestation of His existence, instead of being determined by anything outside of Him (compare Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 81 f.), the name carries us into the sphere of the divine *freedom* (3). It expresses quite generally the absolute *independence* of God in His dominion. Through this factor of its meaning the name Jehovah is connected with El-shaddai.

2. When, in virtue of His absolute independence, God in all His dominion asserts Himself as that which He is, the name further conveys the idea of the absolute *immutability* of God, in virtue whereof He in all things, in words as in deeds, is essentially in agreement with Himself, and remains self-consistent (4). Where this second factor is put in special relation to the divine decree of election, and the promises that flow therefrom, as is the case in Ex. iii. 13 ff., vi. 2 ff., the name implies the invariable *faithfulness* of God, which side of the notion of Jehovah (against Hofmann, *l.c.*) is specially emphasized in the Old Testament, to awake confidence on God; cf. passages like Deut. vii. 9, Hos. xii. 6, in connection with ver. 7, Isa. xxvi. 4 (5). That, as Jehovah, God is the *immutable*, is brought out in Mal. iii. 6 (6). In passages like Isa. xli. 4, xliv. 6, etc., the name is applied both to God's absolute independence and to His absolute immutability. (7).

(1) [More recently the explanation of the name from the *Hiphil* of the root הוה has been maintained by many. יהוה would then be the *giver* of exist-

ence or life. So P. de Lagarde (in several of his writings, and most recently in his *Orientalia*, Part II., and the *Abhand. d. k. Ges. d. W.* at Göttingen, 1880), according to whom the imperfect of הוה in Kal would be יִהְוֶה, and not יִהְיֶה. So Schrader (Art. "Jahve" in Schenkel's *Bibel Lexicon*), with whom Baudissin agrees (i. p. 229); Schultz (p. 486 ff.), is undecided. The passage Ex. iii. 14 presents to him no objection against the Hiphil derivation, since he regards the passage as giving only the religious meaning attached to the name in a later age; but he finds the linguistic reasons against the derivation from Kal not decisive.]

(2) From this point onward I use the word Jehovah, because, as a matter of fact, this name has now become naturalized in our vocabulary, and cannot be supplanted, any more than it would be possible for the more correct *Jarden* to displace the usual form *Jordan*.

(3) Only that the name cannot be interpreted in the sense of absolute *arbitrariness;* as, for example, Drechsler (*The Unity and Genuineness of Genesis*, p. 11 f.) has expounded the passage Ex. iii. 14, "I am He, and what it *pleases* me to be," and "I always reveal myself in all deeds and commands as what I *please*," according to which the name is supposed to express the "free grace" or the "groundless mercy" of God (Drechsler, p. 10).

(4) Also in Ex. xxxiii. 19, which has correctly been adduced to explain iii. 14, the declaration, "I am gracious to whom I am gracious," affirms, 1*st*, that God shows grace to him to whom He will be gracious, and to no other, or the absolute freedom of God's grace; and, 2*d*, that He really shows grace to him to whom He is gracious, that is, He is self-consistent in showing mercy, in reference to His grace agreeing with Himself.

(5) Hos. xii. 6 f.: "And Jehovah, the God of hosts, Jehovah is His memorial name. And thou, to thy God shalt thou turn again; keep godliness and right, and wait continually on thy God." Because Israel calls his God יהוה, therefore should he turn to Him trustfully. Isa. xxvi. 4: "Trust on Jehovah forever, for in Jah Jehovah is an everlasting rock."

(6) Mal. iii. 6: "I am Jehovah, I have not changed, and ye sons of Jacob perish not;" that is, in God's *unchangeableness*, expressed by His name Jehovah, the eternal duration of His covenant people is pledged.—See on this passage, Hengstenberg, *Christology*.

(7) If we proceed from the name alone without regard to Ex. iii., it appears at first sight that only absolute being lies in it. Luther in particular has carried this further in the article on Shem-ham'phorash (Erl. ed. of his German works, xxxii. p. 306). He explains the sense of the name thus: "He has His being from none, has neither beginning nor end, but is from eternity in and of Himself, so that His being cannot be called *been* or to *become*, for He has never begun, and cannot begin to be; He has also never had an end, nor can cease to be; but with Him it is always a pure *is* or *existence*, that is, Jehovah. When the creature was created, His existence was already there, and He is there with His being for all that shall still arise. In this way Christ speaks of His divinity in John viii. 58: Before Abraham was, I am. He does not say, Then I was, as if after that He had been no more, but I am, that is, my being is eternal, it has not been, will not be, but simply is." But here the name is taken up too abstractly; its essential signification is much rather in reference to the history of revelation. This will be clearly shown in the comparison with Elohim.

§ 40.

3. *Age and Origin of the Name Jehovah.*

From what has been said on the signification of the name, it is clear that it is so interwoven with the Old Testament revelation, that its *origin* can only be sought for in this sphere (1). Every attempt to *derive the name from heathenism*

rests on arbitrary hypotheses or on strange misunderstandings ; as, for example, the hypothesis which derives the name from a pretended Egyptian name of God, formed by the seven Greek vowels *ιεηωουα*, although these letters are only intended to indicate the musical scale. Ex. v. 2 (2) speaks decidedly against a derivation from Egypt. That Necho, 2 Kings xxiii. 34, changes the name of the conquered Eliakim to Jehoiakim, is no evidence for the Egyptian character of the name Jehovah ; it is meant to indicate that the Egyptian king acts thus with the help of the national god (so Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Kings xxiv. 17, in changing Mattaniah's name to Zedekiah, gives him a name compounded from Jehovah. Rabshakeh's speech, Isa. xxxvi. 10, is particularly instructive).—But the more exact determination of the Old Testament origin of the name, depends on the explanation of the passage Ex. vi. 3. According to one exposition, the meaning of it is, that the name Jehovah was entirely *unknown* to the patriarchs, and that we have here the *first revelation* of the name ; compare Josephus, *Ant.* ii. 12. 4 (3). In that case, since the frequent use of the name in Genesis certainly cannot simply be referred to prolepsis, there would be a double account of the origin of the name in the Pentateuch. According to the first, Gen. iv. 26, xii. 8, etc., it would reach back to primeval antiquity ; and according to the second, it was first introduced by Moses (4). The other exposition makes Ex. vi. 3 say that the name Jehovah had not *been yet understood* by the patriarchs, and that they had not the *full experience* of that which lies in the name (4). This would make the meaning of the passage correspond exactly with Ex. iii. 15, and be analogous to the passage Ex. xxxiii. 19 ; comp. with xxxiv. 6, in which the announcement of a name of God has simply the force of an unveiling to human knowledge of a quality of the divine nature, without our being able to say that that name did not exist previously. For וְשִׁמְי יהוה לֹא נוֹדַעְתִּי, compare also Ex. viii. 18, Ps. lxxvi. 2, etc. On account of the connection with ver. 7, the first explanation must in any case include the second (5). *Against* the first explanation, however, we have, 1*st*, The occasional occurrence of the name Jehovah even in those parts of Genesis which belong to the Elohistic record, where the expedient of assuming an interpolation is altogether worthless. 2*d*, The occurrence of the name in the name of the mother of Moses, Jochebed יוֹכֶבֶד (that is, *cujus gloria est Jehovah*), Ex. vi. 20, —a fact which has led even Ewald to the view that the name Jehovah was common at least among the maternal ancestors of Moses. There are also some other names from that ancient time which occur in the genealogies in Chronicles, 1 Chron. ii. 25, vii. 8, iv. 18 : *Ahijah*, *Abiah*, *Bithiah* (6). 3*d* and lastly, it is most improbable that Moses, when he had to bring to the people a revelation of the God of their fathers, should have done so under a name of God *quite unknown to the people*. Hence the assertion of the pre-Mosaic origin of the name is right.

(1) Compare the remarks in Hävernick's *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, pp. 56–59.

(2) Ex. v. 2, Pharaoh says : "Who is Jehovah, whose voice I am to obey to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah." In reference to all the hypotheses, on which I cannot enter, which seek to derive the name from Egypt, Phœnicia, or India, the dissertation by Tholuck in the *Literar. Anzeiger*, 1832, Nos. 27–30, and reprinted in his *Vermischte Schriften*, i. 1839, p. 376 ff., still deserves to be consulted. [Comp. especially Baudissin i. p. 220 ff., but also the addition of Delitzsch to the Art. "Jehovah" in the 2d ed. of Herzog. vi. 507 (Schaff's Herzog i. p. 1153), who is more inclined than Baudissin to agree with the conjecture

of Schrader, that the name Jahve in the form *Jahu* is of pre-Israelitish, Semitic origin.]

(3) Josephus says, *l.c.*: *ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ σημαίνει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ προσηγορίαν, οὐ πρότερον εἰς ἀνθρώπους παρελθοῦσαν· περὶ ἧς οὐ μοι θεμιτὸν εἰπεῖν.*

(4) See specially Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*, i. 2d ed. p. 345 f., comp. with ii. p. 67.

(5) Schultz, in his *Old Testament Theology* (p. 489), wonders that I also am here found on the side of the expositors who twist the meaning, which shows that he has not properly appreciated my reasons. The passage Ex. vi. 2 ff. runs thus: "Elohim spoke to Moses, and said: I am יהיה; I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El-shaddai, but by my יהוה name לֹא נוֹדַעְתִּי לָהֶם . . . I have heard the sighs of the sons of Israel . . . Therefore say to the sons of Israel: I am יהוה, and will lead you out from under the burdens of Egypt . . . So I am God to you, and ye acknowledge that I, יהוה, am your God." It is quite clear that the וִידַעְתֶּם in ver. 7 refers back to the נוֹדַעְתִּי לָהֶם in ver. 3; but this וִידַעְתֶּם, of course, does not mean: then shall my title Jehovah become known to you, but: then acknowledge ye what is in my nature. [Schultz in his second edition is very much inclined to assume that the name was not invented by Moses, but was found by him already in existence; the passage in question does not embarrass him in his explanation, because he sees in it only the writer's view with no historical value. His main objection against the explanation of the author of the present work is as follows: It is a fair question, what is meant by the expression, "a name is known without its signification"—since the revelation of a name of God means neither more nor less than that a new side of the Divine Being reveals itself. But this objection does not meet at all the view presented in the text above, but only a misconception of it. For what is maintained is, not that they had the name, but did not understand its verbal signification—but that they did not have the *full experience* of what this name in virtue of its verbal signification (which they could understand) means. Just the side of the Divine Being, which, according to § 39, 2, is contained as the second factor in the word Jehovah, was actually revealed in the redemption of Israel, and thus God presented Himself as to be known by the people of Israel on that side of His nature which the name Jehovah expresses].

(6) [Schultz, in accordance with his critical views of the Elohistic part of the Pentateuch, A, and the book of Chronicles, is prevented from attaching any importance to these names as evidence (see p. 490.)]

§ 41.

Comparison of the Name Jehovah with Elohim and El.

If we compare God's names אֱלֹהִים and אֵל with יְהוָה, in reference to their meaning, the following difference is found to result from the definitions already given (1). In general, all universally cosmical action of God, going out toward the heathen as well as toward Israel in the creation and preservation of the world, is traced to *El* and *Elohim;* to *Jehovah*, on the other hand, is traced every divine act which is connected with the theocratic revelation and guidance, and which bears on the heathen only in as far as their history stands in relation to the aim of the divine kingdom. It follows from this, that the *historical* display of the divine essence lies essentially in the idea of Jehovah; whereas, on the contrary, Elohim, as such, is subject to no historical process. By this, Oetinger's explanation, "Deus est omnium *rerum* Elohim omnium, *actionum* Jehovah," is to be more exactly defined (2). Elohim, as such, remains transcendent to the

world of phenomena ; Jehovah, on the contrary, enters into the phenomena of space and time, in order to manifest Himself to mankind ; a difference which appears at once in the relation of Gen. i. 1 sqq. to ii. 4 sqq. This difference indeed, from the nature of the case, is not strictly kept up everywhere in the Old Testament in the use of the names of God. Since Elohim is only known in Israel as Jehovah, what is Elohistic is often traced back to Jehovah ; less often Elohim stands where we might expect Jehovah, particularly in the *Elohistic psalms*, the peculiarity of which in the pregnant ceremonious use of Elohim is probably to be explained by the theory that they were designed to counteract liturgically a merely national conception of the Deity (3). But still it is shown partly by certain general ways of expression which run through the whole Old Testament, and partly by separate passages, that the Old Testament writers had a very definite consciousness of the indicated difference. In reference to the first head, we must remember that *all expressions which refer to revelation* occur almost entirely in connection with יְהוָה ; thus, with quite rare exceptions, נְאֻם יְהוָה, דִּבֶּר יְהוָה, כֹּה אָמַר, מִצְוֹת, etc., and further, because God is acknowledged and addressed in Israel only as Jehovah, with שֵׁם, also, with the exception only of two passages in Elohistic psalms, Ps. lxix. 31, lxxv. 8 ; even the preponderatingly Elohistic section, 2 Sam. vi., places in ver. 2 שֵׁם יְהוָה. Where no definite reason exists for writing מַלְאַךְ אֱלֹהִים, the Malakh is always the angel of Jehovah. *Theophany* in general is predicated of Jehovah, who, and not Elohim, holds intercourse with man in the manner of men. The change of names in Gen. vii. 16 is specially noteworthy (4). Hence it comes that *anthropomorphisms* are almost always applied to Jehovah, not to Elohim. Thus יַד יְהוָה even in the Elohistic Psalm lxxv. ver. 8 (5) ; thus always פִּי יְהוָה, never פִּי אֱלֹהִים ; so quite often עֵינֵי יְהוָה, קוֹל, only twice עֵינֵי אֱלֹהִים, קוֹל, etc. Of leading individual passages to be particularly mentioned are Gen. ix. 26 f., according to which God is for Japheth mainly only Elohim ; on the contrary, for Shem He is Jehovah ; Num. xvi. 22, compared with xxvii. 16 ; in the first passage (the story of Korah's company), although Jehovah is predominant through the whole section, אֵל is called upon as God of the spirits of all flesh, as He from whom all natural life proceeds, and who as preserver of the world is entreated not to sweep away a multitude of men because of one man who sinned. In the second passage, on the contrary (where the appointment of a successor to Moses is treated of), Jehovah is addressed as God of the spirits of all flesh, who divides the gifts of His Spirit for the service of His kingdom, and is therefore entreated to appoint and equip a new leader of His people. With this compare Ps. xix., where, in reference to the manifestation of God in nature, ver. 1, *El* is used ; while in reference to the revelation in the law, *Jehovah* stands from ver. 7 onward, etc. (6).

(1) Here, of course, those passages are meant where the expressions אֱלֹהִים and אֵל stand by themselves, without an article, adjective, or a dependent genitive (as, God of Jacob).

(2) In a certain sense we may say, with Delitzsch, Jehovah is a God who "becomes" [*γίγνεται*]. But the expression is liable to be misunderstood ; Hengstenberg rightly reminds us, on the other hand, that "God *comes* indeed, but He does not *become*."

(3) It is well known that the *first Psalm book* [Ps. i.–xli.] *is Jehovistic, the*

second, Elohistic [Ps. xlii.–lxxii.]. The assumption of Hitzig and others, that the dread which appears at a later period of using the name Jehovah is manifest in the Elohistic psalms, is utterly untenable, not simply because among these Elohistic songs there are without doubt pieces of an earlier age, but also because they do not absolutely exclude the name Jehovah.

(4) Gen. vii. 16: "And those that went in, went in male and female of all flesh (into the ark to Noah), as *Elohim* had commanded; and *Jehovah* shut the door behind him." [He who gives command is styled Elohim, he who φιλανθρώπως condescends, Jehovah.]

(5) יְ אֱלֹהִים occurs only in a few places, where definite reasons exist.

(6) [This distinction would be incorrect, if the view of Wurm, *Theol. Studien aus Württemberg*, ii. p. 173 ff., were right, that *Elohim* is a superior being, who *reveals* himself to man. His argument is that the one who receives revelations is called "a man of *God*," not "a man of *Jehovah*." But even if no weight should be attached to the fact that in the passages cited by Wurm it is not, except in 1 Sam. ix. 6 and 1 K. xvii. 24, אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים but הָאֱלֹהִים (since the article may be explained as referring not to *a* but *the* man of God), no considerable importance can be given to this one form of expression in opposition to the passages cited in the text above. It is remarkable that in 1 K. xvii. 24 after the words, "I know that thou art a man of God," there follows, "and that the word of *Jehovah* is truth in thy mouth." Is not the explanation of the use of אֱלֹהִים in connection with אִישׁ, that this expression denotes the special relation of a man to the Deity in general and not to the covenant God of Israel? When one is called a "man of God," it is thereby only specified that there has been vouchsafed to him a close relation to the Deity, but not to the Deity who has entered into a historical relation to Israel.]

§ 42.

Attributes or Names of God which are derived immediately from the idea of Jehovah.

From the idea of Jehovah flow the following further properties of the Divine Being:

1. Jehovah is an *eternal* God, אֵל עוֹלָם, as Abraham addresses Him in Gen. xxi. 33; comp. Deut. xxxii. 40, where Jehovah is introduced as Himself saying, "I live to eternity." God's eternity is involved in His absolute independence, in virtue whereof God is not conditioned by anything which originates or decays in time, but is the first and the last (Isa. xliv. 6, xlviii. 12). The longest human measurement of time vanishes when put against His eternal duration, Ps. xc. 4. Still it is not this abstract conception of eternity as an everlasting duration of time which the Old Testament chiefly brings forward; but while God as יְהוָה is the eternal, God's eternity is defined as the *unchangeableness of His being, continuing throughout every change of time*, and thus it becomes the basis of human confidence. Therefore Moses, in the midst of the dying away of his people, addresses God as the Eternal One, Ps. xc. 1 f. (1); therefore, Deut. xxxii. 40, the idea that God is eternal forms the transition to the announcement that He will again save His rejected people; therefore Israel, when sighing in misery, is comforted, Isa. xl. 28: "Knowest thou not, and hast thou not heard, that Jehovah is an eternal God?" Compare also Ps. cii. 28.

2. It is involved in the idea of Jehovah that He is a *living* God: Gen. xvi. 14 (according to the probable explanation of the passage), Deut. v. 23 (26), אֱלֹהִים

חַיִּים; Josh. iii. 10, אֱלֹהֵי. He swears by His life, Num. xiv. 21, 28, compare Deut. xxxii. 40. In the following books the expression is much more common; and here the form of oath, which does not occur in the Pentateuch, חַי יְהוָה, as true as *Jehovah* lives, appears often, never חַי אֱלֹהִים. The latter circumstance is sufficient to indicate that God is not called the living God in the sense of His bearing within Him the powers of physical life, although in every respect the words in Ps. xxxvi. 9, "with Thee is the fountain of life," are applicable to Him; but He is called the Living One, as the God of revelation, in as far as He comes in historical attestations into connection with mankind, and causes Himself to be known to men by the operations of His power. His first appearance as the God who, ruling in free activity, causes nature to serve His aims, and is therefore called the living God, is to the forsaken Hagar, Gen. xvi. 13 f. (according to the most probable explanation): "She called the name of Jehovah who spoke to her, Thou art a God of seeing," that is, who sees (whose care does not even overlook a rejected helpless one in the desert); for she said, "Have I then here looked after God, who sees me? Therefore the name of the well (where Hagar had this manifestation) is the well of the Living One, who seeth me" (1). Jehovah's speech from out of the fire on Sinai is called the voice of the living God, Deut. v. 23; He is acknowledged as the living God in the midst of the congregation by His deeds of revelation, Josh. iii. 10, and by His words of revelation, Jer. xxiii. 36. As a living God, He also enters with man into a relation of fellowship which is experienced by him inwardly, especially as a God who hears prayer, and hence the longing of the godly for the living God (Ps. xlii. 3, lxxxiv. 3). As the Living One, Jehovah is contrasted with the gods of the heathen, which can reveal nothing, perform nothing, grant no requests, and send no help, Deut. xxxii. 37–39; which are nothings, אֱלִילִים, Lev. xix. 4, xxvi. 1, etc.; and dead, מֵתִים, Ps. cvi. 28 (2). Hence the idea of the living God is specially carried out in what the prophets and the psalms say against the heathen; for example, Jer. x. 10 ff., comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 36, Isa. xxxvii. 4, 17, etc. Terror for those of guilty conscience, and comfort for those seeking help, both lie in the idea of the divine vitality, and hence in Israel there is no higher oath than the declaration, Jehovah lives (חַי יְהוָה).

3. Jehovah is the *Lord*, הָאָדוֹן; my Lord, אֲדֹנָי. That the idea of אֲדֹנָי is immediately connected with the idea of Jehovah is clear from the fact that the two names are frequently associated, and that אֲדֹנָי could in later times be substituted in reading for יהוה. The word אֲדֹנָי is the plural of אָדוֹן, which is derived from דון, to direct, to rule. The plural is to be explained as in אֱלֹהִים (§ 36); but the ending ־ָי is not (as many have assumed) a plural ending, for the existence of such a termination is more than doubtful, but it is the suffix of the first person, which is pointed with Kametz to distinguish God's name from the common use of אֲדֹנָי (= my lords, comp. *e.g.* Gen. xix. 2) (3). In the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, in which אֲדֹנָי only occurs in *addressing* God, the suffix still has its meaning; compare such passages as Gen. xv. 2, 8, xviii. 3, 27, 30 ff., in Jehovistic context, and in Elohistic context, Gen. xx. 4 (in the mouth of Abimelech); and further, passages like Ex. xxxiv. 9, Num. xiv. 17, Deut. iii. 24, ix. 26; especially אֲדֹנָי is connected with the particle of request בִּי, Ex. iv. 10,

13, Josh. vii. 8, in addresses of supplication. In the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, where Jehovah is not directly addressed as the Lord, we find not אֲדֹנָי, but הָאָדוֹן, Ex. xxxiv. 23, or אֲדֹנֵי הָאֲדֹנִים, Deut. x. 17, or אֲדוֹן כָּל־הָאָרֶץ, Josh. iii. 13. Later, however, the meaning of the suffix became blunted, so that the expression is frequently found even when God is spoken of in the third person. But when God Himself speaks, He never makes use of the word; the passages Job xxviii. 28, Isa. viii. 7, form only an apparent exception (4). According to the original meaning of the expression ("my Lord"), there lies in it, as shown by the above-cited passages, not simply the acknowledgment of the divine sovereignty in general, but in particular the consciousness of specially belonging to God, as is the case with the organs of revelation among the covenant people, the consciousness of standing under His immediate guidance and protection. Thus far it was quite wrong to stamp the Old Testament religion as a religion of fear on account of the frequent use of "Lord," since אֲדֹנָי is more the expression of trust in its original meaning. On the contrary, the idea of the powerful Ruler over all lies in the later use of the expression, after the sense of the suffix had ceased to be felt, Isa. viii. 7, xl. 10, etc. (5).

(1) Thus Delitzsch (among others) explains the difficult passage Gen xvi. 13 f. Side by side with this explanation there is another, according to which our passage would not belong to this topic. Keil reads רָאֳי as the pausal-form of רֳאִי instead of רֹאִי, and translates, "Have I here also seen after this seeing? Therefore the well was called the Well of the Living-seeing" (as a compound noun); that is, the well where a man remains in life when he sees God. Hagar was astonished that she still saw after having seen the מַלְאָךְ of God; that is, that she still remained in life, since it was impossible to remain alive after having had a manifestation of God. Against the first explanation, Keil says that it would require רֹאֲנִי; but in Job vii. 8 רֹאִי similarly stands.

(2) The word אֱלִיל means "nothing," from אלל; but it is manifest that by this word, a sort of diminutive of אֵל, little God, was also intended.

(3) It is peculiar that, when אֲדֹנָי is the name of God, it stands with prefixes לַאדֹנָי, וַאדֹנָי; otherwise the א is pointed, *e.g.* לֵאלֹהֵינוּ.

(4) Job xxviii. 28 should be read, according to most manuscripts and the oldest editions, יְהוָה; in Isa. viii. 7 a change of subject must be presumed, with a transition to the prophet as speaker. Amos vi. 8 does not belong to this head at all.

(5) The word אדני occurs 134 times in the text.—אֲדֹנָי has been compared with the Phœnician Adonis, against which it is enough to remark that the two have nothing in common except the name.

§ 43.

The Unity of God.

Jehovah is one. Although the multiplicity of divine powers broken up in polytheism is summed up into unity in Elohim, yet it is as Jehovah that God is first fully recognized as *one;* and thus monotheism forms one of the fundamental doctrines of Mosaism. Hence Ex. xx. 3, "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me" (עַל־פָּנַי, above me, or in addition to me), is placed foremost in the decalogue. Nevertheless, the thorough-going monotheism of the Pentateuch has often been

denied ; and it has been maintained, either, 1*st*, that *the unity of God was developed gradually from a polytheistic religion*, or, 2*d*, that *the Mosaic Jehovah does not exclude the existence of other gods*. Let us more closely examine these two views (1).

1. Passages like Gen. i. 26, xi. 7 (where Jehovah says, "*We* will go down and confound their language"), also iii. 22, are cited in support of the first view. But even if we (comp. § 36) refuse to admit in the two first-named passages the conception of the plural as the plural of majesty—though this view is quite admissible—the plural would in no case be referable to other gods, but at most to higher spiritual beings, as the angels ; so that on xi. 7, we should compare Isa. vi. 8 in reference to the expression, and in reference to the matter Zech. xiv. 5 (2). In regard to the *third* passage, in which Jehovah says, "Man is become כְּאַחַד מִמֶּנּוּ, like one of us" (and where the plural is certainly not to be understood as a plural of majesty, as Keil still understands it), the words convey the meaning, Man has beome like a being *of my species ;* and thus the expression does not suppose other gods, but only the existence of a plurality of spiritual beings. But in general, the following is to be noted in opposition to the view just indicated : If the Mosaic monotheism was the result of such a developing process, this process must certainly be relegated to a period prior to the composition of the Old Testament. The whole exhibition of the Divine Being in Gen. i.–x. assumes most distinctly the universality of the idea of God ; and even after revelation has restricted itself to one race, the divine training aims continually at awaking the consciousness of this universality ; comp. the instructive passage Gen. xxviii. 15 f. (3). But if the Old Testament monotheism was developed from polytheism, the other gods from the midst of whom Jehovah had raised Himself as the highest God, must still have existed somehow in the mind ; perhaps degraded to the level of angels, but still regarded as beings endued with a certain independence of action. But, as we shall see, the angelology of the Old Testament follows the contrary course ; it is only *at its close* that angels endowed with definite personal attributes appear. In heathen religions the tendency to monotheism appears not merely in the superiority of a supreme God to the other gods, but also in the attempt to find a unity in an *abstract power* standing over the world of gods—as, for example, in the Indian Brahma conceived as a neuter, and in the ὄντως ὄν of the later Greek theology, *e.g.* in Plutarch. But an idea like that of Jehovah is nowhere developed from the polytheistic process, and nowhere are the many gods condensed into one Being (4).

2. If, by the assertion that the Jehovah of the Old Testament does not exclude the existence of other gods, it is only meant that *many of the Israelites* regarded Jehovah only as a God beside other gods of the people, this cannot be disputed. In Jephthah's words indeed, Judg. xi. 24 (5), which are specially cited as evidence to the point, it is a question whether his argument does not proceed on Moabite ideas, without admitting their correctness ; still it is historically certain that even a Solomon at a later time could waver on this point. It is clear, however, that this view is always combated by the organs of revelation as a perversion of the idea of Jehovah.—In reference to the *separate passages* to which the assertion appeals, Ex. xviii. 11, "Jehovah is greater than all gods," does not come into consideration, being the word of a heathen (Jethro). But when it

is said, xx. 3, "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me;" xii. 12, "I will execute judgments on all the gods of Egypt, I am Jehovah;" xv. 11, "Who among the gods is like Thee, Jehovah?" these passages are to be explained by referring to others in the same book; such as ix. 29, "the earth is Jehovah's;" further, xx. 11, xxxi. 17, "in six days Jehovah made the heaven and the earth," etc.—passages which most decidedly exclude the opinion that other gods rule side by side with Jehovah within the boundaries of their own people and land. How little the expression אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים (other gods) is to be taken in the sense in which the heathen speak of *Dii novi, advenæ, peregrini*, is shown by the frequent occurrence of this expression *in the prophets*, whose strict monotheism is certainly beyond all doubt; *e.g.* comp. Isa. xix. 1 with Ex. xii. 12. The passages in *Deuteronomy* to which appeal is made prove no more than those just cited from Exodus. If it is said, chap. xxxii. 12, "Jehovah led Israel alone, no strange god was with Him," the strange gods are called, ver. 21, לֹא־אֵל and הַבְלֵיהֶם—*breaths, nothings* (which correspond fully with אֱלִילִים, Lev. xix. 4, and תֹּהוּ, 1 Sam. xi. 21). Compare Ps. xcvi., where it is said, ver. 4, "Jehovah is fearful above all gods," but in ver. 5 is immediately added, "for all the gods of the people are nothings." Hence we gather the meaning of Deut. xxxii. 39: "See ye now that I am He, and there is no god with me; I kill and give life." Further, if we take into view x. 14, "Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens, the earth and all that is upon it, are Jehovah thy God's"—there can be no doubt that the *dicta probantia* so called must be understood as affirming the unity of God in the strictest sense. These are: chap. iv. 35, "Jehovah is *the* God (הָאֱלֹהִים), and none but He;" again in ver. 39, "Jehovah is God in the heavens above, and in the earth beneath; there is none but He;" and lastly the passage, vi. 4: שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד. [A. V. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.*] This cannot mean (as many have explained it), "Jehovah is our God, Jehovah alone," that is, Israel has only Jehovah for his God; for in that case we must have had לָבַדּוֹ instead of אֶחָד. There are only two admissible explanations: either, "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God, Jehovah is one" (אֶחָד as predicate to the second Jehovah); or יְהוָה אֶחָד is predicate to יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, "Jehovah our God is One (a single) Jehovah." On the latter explanation the meaning is not (as Schultz has conceived in his Commentary on Deuteronomy): Our God has not sometimes this and sometimes that manner of manifestation, but only one single one, viz., as Jehovah (which introduces an entirely foreign thought into the passage); this second construction would be better explained, with Keil: Jehovah our God is the single absolutely independent and abiding one, and therefore He to whom alone divine reality belongs. Still the first explanation seems to me to be the more correct. For the demand, ver. 5, to dedicate to Him the whole heart and undivided love, and, ver. 14, not to go after heathen gods (6), is thus based on the fact that Jehovah is absolutely one. In the later books, comp. in the way of illustration such passages especially as Isa. xliii. 10, xliv. 6, xlv. 5, xlv. 18, etc.

Another question is, whether the gods of the heathen did not exist according to the Old Testament, if not as gods, at least as *living beings*, perhaps as demons. But for this also there is no evidence; for the expression שֵׂרִים, Deut.

xxxii. 17, discussed in § 37, and specially appealed to in this connection, though in the Septuagint it is rendered *δαιμόνια*, gives us in its true meaning, *lords*, nothing but the conception of the heathen (7). It is rather characteristic of the antagonism of the Old Testament to the worship of idols, that the images are identified with the gods themselves, and thereby the nullity of the latter is shown; compare passages like Isa. xliv. 9 ff., Jer. x. 3 ff. In Isa. xlvi. 1 f., compared with xli. 29, the distinction between the gods and their images is simply apparent for the sake of vividness. Note also the practical demonstration of the nullity of Baal, 1 Kings xviii. 21 ff. (at the scene on Carmel).

(1) Schultz, in his *Old Testament Theology*, p. 440 ff., treats the question on the whole very well, and in a peculiar way. Compare especially the thorough investigation of Baudissin in Part I.: "The Old Testament view of the heathen gods."

(2) In Isa. vi. 8, the seraphim are comprehended in the לָנוּ; Zech. xiv. 5 speaks of the descent of Jehovah with all the holy ones.

(3) In Gen. xxviii. 15 f., the promise is given to Jacob that God will lead him wherever he goes; Jacob says on awaking: I knew not that God is also in this place. Thus the too exclusive view is here corrected.

(4) Vatke's remarks on this in his *Religion of the Old Testament*, pp. 705–707, are very sound; compare also, on the tendency to monotheism in the Greek religion, Roth's review of Nägelsbach's "Homeric Theology," *Erl. Zeitschr.* 1841.

(5) Judg. xi. 24. Jephthah, in negotiating with Moab, says: "Is it not so, what thy god Chemosh gives thee to inherit, that thou inheritest?"

(6) Judaism is certainly right in continually proclaiming the passage Deut. vi. 4 (called the שְׁמַע, from its first word) as the most holy word, which includes the fundamental doctrine of monotheism.

(7) The designation of the heathen gods as אֱלִילִים (§ 42) speaks also against this idea. It is indeed probable that in 1 Cor. viii. 4 ff., x. 19 f., Paul, when he uses the word *δαιμόνια* in speaking of the Greek gods, takes it from the LXX Deut. xxxii. 17; but Paul there maintains, in my opinion, not that the individual heathen gods are demons, but only that in the service of the heathen gods a demonic element prevails.

IV. GOD AS THE HOLY ONE.

§ 44.

Formal Definition of the Idea.

God is קָדוֹשׁ, the *Holy* One (1). Etymologically, the root-meaning of קָדוֹשׁ cannot be exactly defined. According to the most likely view, the stem קדשׁ is related to חדשׁ, cognate with the root רשׁ, as the root-meaning of which, "*enituit*, to break forth with splendor," is to be accepted. Thus the idea of the breaking forth of brilliant light would lie in the word; compare specially Isa. x. 17, where the epithet "*Light of Israel*" corresponds to the *Holy One* of Israel. [This view must be given up. With far greater probability the word קָדוֹשׁ must be referred to the fundamental meaning, "separated," from which the more specific meaning "pure" could be directly derived.] In order to get the full biblical meaning of the word, we must follow the historical development of the thought.

The designation of God as the Holy One appears first in the Old Testament at the redemption of Israel and the founding of the theocracy. The first declaration of the divine holiness is found in Moses' song of praise, Ex. xv. 11, where it is said, in reference to God's great deeds in leading Israel out of Egypt: "Who is like Thee among the gods, *glorious in holiness*, to be praised with awe, doing wonders?" To this it corresponds that Israel also, when received into the covenant of God, receives the predicate of the *holy* people, xix. 6. The stamp of holiness is so imprinted on the events at the founding of the theocracy, that, as Achelis strikingly reminds us (in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1847, p. 192), in Ex. xix. 10, 14 the expression "sanctify" is used for the same action which is called in Gen. xxxv. 2 "cleanse yourselves." All covenant regulations rest on the principle: I am holy, and ye must also be holy (Lev. xi. 44 f., and passages like xix. 2, xx. 8, xxi. 8).

When holiness is predicated of the covenant *people* and covenant *ordinances*, two things are implied: 1*st*, being taken out of worldliness; 2*d*, being appropriated by God,—a relation of special appropriation to Him. Whenever this character of holiness pertains to anything, this never rests on a natural quality. Nothing created is in itself holy. The idea of natural purity and impurity does not coincide with that of holiness and unholiness. The holiness of the creature always goes back to an act of the divine will, to divine election and institution (3). In other words: It is always a state in which the creature is bound to God by the appointment of God Himself, which is expressed by קֹדֶשׁ, קָדוֹשׁ, קֹדֶשׁ, הַקָּדִישׁ; whereas the opposite expressions חֹל, חָלַל, הֶחֱל, etc. (comp. Lev. x. 10, xxii. 9, Ezek. xxii. 26, xxxvi. 21, xxxix. 7, etc.), designate the profane as set loose, freed, and abandoned (4).

Where קָדוֹשׁ is a designation of a *divine attribute*, there evidently lies in it primarily a negative element, by which it designates a state of *apartness*, God raising Himself up above others. So Jehovah, as the Holy One, stands first in opposition to the other, imaginary gods, Ex. xv. 11: "Who is like Thee among the gods? who is like Thee, glorious in holiness!" And then also in opposition to all that is of the creature, or, more generally expressed, to all that is not He Himself, Isa. xl. 25: "To whom will ye compare me that I may be like? saith the Holy One." In other words: As the Holy One, God is He who is raised absolutely above the world; compare Ps. xcix. 2–5 where God's elevation over all people is connected with His holiness; Isa. v. 16, in which the truth that the holy God sanctifies Himself in justice corresponds to His being exalted by judgment (comp. ii. 17). Accordingly this divine elevation is God's absolute uniqueness, 1 Sam. ii. 2: "There is none holy like Jehovah, for there is none but Thee." The positive expression for God's absolute elevation and uniqueness would be, that in His transcendence above the world, and in His apartness from the creature, God is He who ever preserves His own proper character, maintaining Himself in that being which is distinct from everything created.

This element of the divine holiness was held fast, though certainly in a very superficial manner, by those who defined holiness as the incomparableness and exclusive adorableness of God. Thus Zachariä in his *Biblical Theology*, and more precisely Storr in his *Doctrina Christiana*, § 30 (6).—Menken and his school opposed this conception of the divine holiness (7). In opposition to the ordinary

conception, they maintained that the divine holiness does not so much designate the incomparable glory of God, as His condescending grace, His self-abasing love, and thus does not express the divine apartness from the creature, but rather God's communication of Himself to him; according to this, the expression קָדוֹשׁ is synonymous with חָכִיד. In support of this Menken referred to the following passages:—Ps. ciii., in which in ver. 1 the writer calls upon his soul to praise the divine holiness, and then praises God as the gracious One, He who forgives sin and frees from all evil (compare also Ps. cv. 3); Hos. xi. 8 f., where the divine holiness is placed in connection with divine mercy: "My mercies are kindled together. I will not execute the fierceness of my fury, I will not destroy Ephraim again: for I am God, and not man, holy in the midst of thee;" compare further, Ps. xxii. 4, xxxiii. 21, and other texts.—It was not difficult to show that this conception of Menken does not do justice to the biblical thought. It cannot be denied that, when God reveals Himself in His holiness, the main feeling awakened in man is the feeling of timidity before the severity and fearfulness of the Divine Being; thus from Ex. iii. 5 onward, and (not to look in the first instance at the Pentateuch) compare further *e. g.* 1 Sam. vi. 20, in which, after a dreadful visitation, it is said: "Who can stand before Jehovah, this holy God?" Isa. vi., where the prophet, on hearing the Trisagion of the seraphim, cries out, ver. 5, "Woe is me! I am undone, for I am a man of unclean lips;" v. 16, where, in reference to the approaching judgment, it is said, "The holy God sanctifies Himself in righteousness." The Alexandrian translators had a correct feeling for this element. They translated the word קָדוֹשׁ by *ἅγιος*, an expression derived from *ἄζομαι*, which points to that revering dread which that which is holy demands for itself (8). But still, on the other side, it is clear from the above-cited passages that the conception of Menken must contain an element of truth (9). This element is found in the fact that the divine holiness contains not only the divine self-maintenance, but also the divine *self-disclosure*, since God as the Holy One does not remain in Himself, but gives effect to His holiness out of Himself, by instituting a separation in the world, for His own aims, electing a people out of the mass of the nations of the world, accepting them as His property, and imprinting on the ordinances which He gives to this people, and on the historical providence by which they are guided, the stamp of this separation from worldliness, and of this specific relation to Himself. See, as the principal passage, Lev. xx. 26: "I am holy, and so I have separated you from among the nations to be mine." Therefore the Holy One of Israel (10) is Israel's Maker (Isa. xlv. 11) (compare § 82), Israel's Redeemer (xlix. 7) (11); therefore God, as the holy God, is the doer of miracles, עֹשֵׂה פֶּלֶא, properly He that doeth "things apart," Ex. xv. 11. On the connection of the idea of miracle with the divine holiness, compare also Ps. lxxvii. 14 f., xcviii. 1 (and § 64) (12). The way in which, according to what has been just developed, two things lie in the divine holiness,—that He stands in opposition to the world, and again, that He removes this opposition by choosing in the world some whom he places in communion with Himself, or, to make use of Schmieder's expression, the way in which God's holiness is the interpenetration of God's self-maintenance and self-disclosure,—is very beautifully expressed in Isa. lvii. 15: "Thus saith the high and lofty One, who dwells eternally, the Holy One is his name; I dwell in the heights and in the holy place,

and with those who are broken and humble in spirit." (13)—The passages urged by Menken are also explicable from what has been noted. All demonstrations of the divine covenant of grace are the issues of the divine holiness. Outside of the theocratic relations it is closed to the world; but as soon as the world comes into connection with the divine kingdom, it receives manifestations of the divine holiness (14).

(1) In virtue of its pregnancy, the divine holiness (J. A. Bengel calls it *vere inexhaustæ significationis*) is one of the most difficult terms in the Bible to define. Quite opposite views of its meaning have been brought forward. Of the literature, compare Achelis, "Attempt to decide the Meaning of the Word קדש from the History of the Divine Revelation," in Ullmann's *Studien und Kritiken*, 1847, p. 187 ff.; Rupprecht, "On the definition of God's Holiness," in the same, 1849, p. 684 ff.; Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Kultus*, i. p. 37, ii. p. 27 ff.; Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 81 ff.; Lutz, *Bibl. Dogmatik*, p. 89 ff., etc.; also my article, "Heiligkeit Gottes," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xix. p. 618 ff. [and Delitzsch's art. in 2d ed. of Herzog]. Diestel gives the most comprehensive examination of the matter, "die Heiligkeit Gottes," *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 3 ff. [and Baudissin, *A. T. Studien*, ii. p. 5 ff.].

(2) [Compare on the etymology, Baudissin, p. 19 ff., and the art. of Delitzsch, p. 714 ff.]

(3) On the holiness of the covenant people, comp. § 82, 2.—In the same way, the character of holiness is attached to *localities* which, since the God who revealed Himself in Israel manifests His presence in them, have become appropriated in an especial manner by Him. First, in Ex. iii. 5, the place of the theophany is called holy ground; while in Gen. xxviii. 17, on a similar occasion, it was said, "How dreadful (נוֹרָא) is this place!" Then the tabernacle is sanctified by being filled with the splendor of God, and because He holds intercourse with His people from this place (Ex. xxix. 43 f.); the camp is holy, according to Deut. xxiii. 15, because Jehovah walks in the midst of it. And further, holiness is predicated of the *times* set apart for divine worship (as early as Gen. ii. 3), in speaking of the seventh day of the week, because there already the writer looks forward to the theocratic regulation to which the institution of the Sabbath really belongs (see later); lastly, of the *actions* in which the people give effect to their devotion to God, and of the *things* which they dedicate to Him, and which thus pass into His ownership.—Diestel, *l.c.*, has said very rightly, p. 7: "Inside Mosaism the whole sphere of the holy owes its origin to the will of Jehovah, who is reckoned throughout as an absolutely free and powerful personality. Therefore, in the most exact sense of the word, nothing is holy in and for itself till the will of Jehovah declares it to be His property." See the details under the head of ordinances of worship.

(4) On the latter, see Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 82. But we cannot agree with Hofmann, that in קָדוֹשׁ the relation to God is not immediately thought of, and that it means, generally speaking, "what stands outside the common course, the common order of things." That the religious signification of קדש is inseparable from the word, is shown also by the expressions קָדֵשׁ and קְדֵשָׁה, which are only employed in respect to heathenism, and which in like manner characterize persons dedicated to the Deity.—It is quite wrong to explain the term קִדֵּשׁ מִלְחָמָה by saying that war "breaks through the common daily course of life." Nay, in all those passages where the expression occurs, it relates to a struggle for the cause of God, whether this is the real design (Joel iv. 9) or only the assertion (Mic. iii. 5) of the combatants, or whether the notion is, that the combat is ordained to execute the divine counsel.

(5) Upon this element of divine self-preservation, compare especially Schmieder, *Betrachtungen über das hohepriesterliche Gebet*, 1848, a book which is not known so well as it deserves to be. He rightly says, p. 125: "God's holiness is

God's self-preservation, by virtue of which He remains like Himself in all relations which either are in Him or on which He enters in any way, and neither gives up any part of His divinity nor accepts anything ungodly."

(6) Zachariä, *l.c.* p. 242 : I am holy, means : "None may be honored as God, as Jehovah is honored in Israel." Storr, *l.c.* : "Divina natura vocatur sancta, h. e. sejuncta ab omnibus aliis et incomparabilis."

(7) Menken's *Versuch einer Anleitung zum eigenen Unterricht in den Wahrheiten der heiligen Schrift* (a sort of popular theology), 3d ed. 1833, p. 58 ff. (complete edition of his writings, vi. p. 46 ff.), is especially to be named ; compare also Achelis, in the above-cited essay, p. 198 f.

(8) See on this point the subtile remarks by Zezschwitz, *Profangräcität und bibl. Sprachgeist*, 1859, p. 15.

(9) "Holiness," says Schmieder (*l.c.* 125) correctly, "would not be holiness, but exclusiveness, if it did not presuppose God's entrance into multifarious relations, and thereby the revelation and communication of Himself."

(10) On the title, "The Holy One of Israel," see Caspari, in the *Zeitschr. für luther. Theol.* 1844, iii. p. 92 ff.

(11) The restoration of Israel is also an issue of the divine holiness, since God in virtue of this attribute, effaces the antithesis in which the rejection of Israel stands to His purpose of election (Ezek. xxxvi. 16 ff., xxxvii. 26–28).

(12) Diestel errs decidedly when he (*l.c.* p. 11) says : "Jehovah is holy, inasmuch as He belongs to the people of Israel, is Israel's property."

(13) [Against the view that the self-disclosure of God is contained in the idea of the divine holiness, Baudissin urges the etymology of קָדוֹשׁ, the intransitive meaning of which makes it impossible to explain it as "imparting the attribute of holiness" (p. 22). If the concrete idea of holiness for the root קדשׁ was settled when the adjective קָדוֹשׁ was formed, the objection of Baudissin would be pertinent, and קָדוֹשׁ could only signify one who *possesses* this attribute of holiness, and not one who imparts it. But Baudissin himself shows that the etymology of the word gives only the signification "separated," and we must derive the idea from what is said of the holy (cf. *e.g.* p. 79 f.). The etymological signification of the word presents us with the problem to be investigated, viz., what in God is the specific, peculiar, and singular thing on account of which he is indicated by קָדוֹשׁ as the separated or singular one, or, as Baudissin himself says, "What special attribute ascribed to the Deity was regarded as so central that . . . in it could be found the expression in general of the divine existence?" That which constitutes holiness, therefore, cannot be determined by the original signification of the word.—But the real question is, whether the passages which have been urged, as making the *self-disclosure* of God an element in the idea of holiness, sustain this view. Comp. against it the remarks of Baudissin on Isa. lvii. 15, Hos. xi. 9, Ps. ciii. etc., p. 108 f. The translation of Lev. xx. 26, "I am holy, *and so* have I separated you," which represents the election of Israel as the result of the divine holiness, is regarded by Baudissin (p. 95) as changing the meaning. The ו consecutive in וָאַבְדִּיל, which is made to mean "and so," may be understood as expressing a different thought. Baudissin thinks it to be, not that Israel's election is an effect of the holiness of Jehovah, but that the requirement of holiness from Israel is placed on the ground that he who has chosen Israel as his own is holy.]

(14) Compare also the doctrine of the kingdom of God in the theology of prophecy.

§ 45.

Fuller Definition of the Idea.

But the idea of the divine holiness has been only formally defined by what we have said hitherto. If, in order to come at the concrete side of the matter, we proceed from the question, What is the meaning of *God's sanctifying a people to*

Himself?—generally speaking, the answer is, that it relates to the restoration of a perfect life, both inwardly and outwardly (1). Now, if we argue from this to the meaning of the divine holiness, it may be defined concretely as an *absolute perfection of life*, but essentially in an *ethical* sense. Many, indeed, have gone further, among whom are J. A. Bengel (2) and Rupprecht; the view of the latter (*l.c.* p. 691) comes to this, that the holiness of God designates the whole divine perfection, majesty, and blessedness, "the whole complex of that which we, in our human imperfection and shortsightedness, are wont to look at and represent singly in the individual attributes of God."—It is indeed true that the notions of divine *holiness* and *glory* are related. We may say, with Oetinger, holiness is hidden glory, and glory disclosed holiness. The tabernacle and the temple, for example, are sanctified, because Jehovah filled them with His glory, and made His dwelling-place in them (Ex. xl. 34; 1 Kings viii. 11). In the same way, in Isa. vi. 3, the praise of God as the *Holy One* corresponds to the proclamation, The earth is full of His *glory*. But the divine glory reaches beyond the spheres in which the divine holiness operates. When it is said in Gen. viii. 2, "How glorious is Thy name in all the earth!" it could not be said in the same sense, "How holy is Thy name," etc. God's glory extends over nature, and is given back to Him by all His creatures (Ps. civ. 31); on the other hand, the course of nature serves the divine holiness only so far as God encroaches on it for the purposes of His kingdom, and makes use of the powers of nature for them. So, also, the divine spirit is not the *Holy* Spirit as the cosmical principle of life, but is such only as it rules in the theocracy (Isa. lxiii. 10 f.; Ps. li. 13).

From this it is sufficiently clear that the unlimited extension of the idea of the divine holiness above cited cannot be correct. But let us consider, further, what sort of fear it is that seizes man when God is revealed as the Holy One. It is evidently not simply the feeling of creature weakness, but predominantly and specifically the feeling of human sinfulness and impurity (Isa. vi. 5 and others). Hence it follows that the divine holiness, even if, as absolute perfection of life, it involves the negation of *all* bonds of creature finitude (from which passages like Isa. xl. 25 are explained), is nevertheless mainly *separation from the impurity and sinfulness of the creature*, or, expressed positively, the clearness and purity of the divine nature, which excludes all communion with what is wicked. In this sense the symbolical designation of the divine holiness is, that God is *light* (comp. Isa. x. 17) (3).—Now with this corresponds the fact, that the divine holiness, as a *revealed* attribute, is not an abstract power, which merely pronounces over the finite, as such, the judgment of nothingness, but is the divine self-representation and self-testimony for the purpose of giving to the world a participation in the perfection of the divine life (4).—By means of this ethical conception of divine holiness, the Old Testament is distinguished from Islam, in which the designation of God as the Holy King shows merely the divine elevation and majesty, and therefore in Islam the divine righteousness is also conceived of as the mere expression of the power of the omniscient and omnipotent one (5).

(1) See Diestel, *l.c.* p. 12 ff.

(2) On this subject Bengel expresses himself in a letter to Kasp. Neumann (see Bengel's *Literary Correspondence*, published by Burk, 1836, p. 52 ff.): "De Deo ubi scriptura nomen illud קדש enunciat, statuo non denotare solam puritatem

voluntatis, sed quicquid de Deo cognoscitur, et quicquid insuper de Illo, si se uberius revelare velit, cognosci possit," etc., on which he seeks to prove that all the divine attributes, also the divine self-existence, eternity, omnipotence, etc., are contained in holiness. (The letter written in 1712 is, however, to be recognized as a rather immature and youthful work in the whole style of treatment.)

(3) Compare the definition of the divine holiness in Quenstedt as *Summa in Deo puritas;* also Thomasius, Dogmatik i. p. 137, and especially p. 141; Godet, *la Sainteté de Dieu*, Neuch. 1864, p. 8. [So substantially Ewald understands the divine holiness. (*Lehre von Gott*, ii. p. 239 f.).]

(4) In antithesis to the *heathen* gods, who more or less foster wickedness and are its patrons, it is said of Israel's God, Ps. v. 5 ff., "Thou art not a God whom crime delighteth, neither shall a wicked person dwell with Thee; the insolent shall not appear before Thine eyes; Thou hatest all that do evil; Thou blottest out those who speak lies; Jehovah abhors the man of lying and blood." In reference to this ethical meaning of the divine holiness, compare also Hos. xi. 9, where God is called "the Faithful and Holy One;" Hab. i. 12, in connection with ver. 13; Job vi. 10 [also John xvii. 11, 17].

(5) See on this, Dettinger, "Beiträge zu einer Theologie des Korans," in the *Tübinger Zeitschr. für Theol.* 1834, i. p. 25.

§ 46.

Characteristics connected with the Divine Holiness: 1. *Impossibility of Picturing God, Omnipresence, Spirituality.*

A number of other characteristics of the Divine Being are connected with the idea of the divine holiness, and must now be enumerated.

Inasmuch as the divine holiness is the separateness of the Divine Being from all finiteness of the creature, it includes the *impossibility of forming an image* of the Divine Being. For the connection of the two ideas compare the passage Isa. xl. 25, already quoted (§ 44). On this is grounded the prohibition of representing God by an image. It is true that no more would follow directly from the passages Ex. xx. 4, Deut. v. 8, than that God is not to be represented by the image of any existing creature. But Deut. iv. 15 ff. shows that the prohibition of any figure and form of the Divine Being is absolute. And not only is the representation of the Divine Being by an image made by the hand of man excluded, but also the adoration of the divine in the constellations, ver. 19 compared with xxix. 25 (1). Now if, on the other hand, a הְמוּנַת יְהוָה is spoken of in Num. xii. 8, we are to understand here, as in the theophanies spoken of in Genesis, that there is a distinction between the sinking of God's being into visibility, and that being in itself (2). Neither can any argument contradictory to the clear utterances of the Old Testament as to the idea of God be drawn from *anthropomorphisms*—using the word in the more limited sense, in distinction from anthropopathies, to denote those expressions in the Scriptures in which parts of the human body, or more generally the senses, are transferred to God, so that eyes, ears, nose, etc., and hence seeing, hearing, smelling, and the like, are used in speaking of Him. No religion can dispense with such anthropomorphic expressions when it enters into the sphere of representative thought, and everything depends on making it sure that the literal application of such expressions shall be corrected by the whole conception of the idea of God (3). It is also to be

noted, that in the later books of the Old Testament, in which are found the strongest utterances on the freedom of the Divine Being from creature forms (as Ps. l. 12 f., etc.), the anthropomorphisms are not the less frequent.—Still the question remains to be answered, *whether and how far, according to the Old Testament, the Divine Being is freed from the limitations of space.* It is self-evident that the Pentateuch regards God, to whom, Deut. x. 14, the heaven and the heavens of heaven, the earth and all that is upon it, belong, as *omnipresent*, even when such express delineations of omnipresence as in Ps. cxxxix. are not found in the Pentateuch. In different passages, however, it is explicitly declared that wherever man is, God gives him to experience His protecting nearness, or more generally expressed, His communion. Compare such passages as Gen. xvi. 13, xxviii. 15 ff., xlvi. 4, etc. Beyond this, the Pentateuch has mainly to do with the *special* presence which God gives by living among His people, when He localizes His face, His name, His glory—the so-called Shekhina (comp. § 63).—The express declaration that God is *spirit* does not occur in the Old Testament, which is rather accustomed to say that God *has* the spirit, and causes it to go out from Him; by which, however, the Spirit is indicated as the element of God's life; compare Isa. xl. 13, Ps. cxxxix. 7, and further the contrast, Isa. xxxi. 3. The absolute personality of God is pregnantly expressed in the word אֲנִי הוּא, "I am He," Deut. xxxii. 39, Isa. xliii. 10.

(1) Deut. iv. 15 ff.: "Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of figure (כָּל־תְּמוּנָה) when Jehovah spake to you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire," etc. Ver. 19: "Thou shalt not lift up thine eyes unto heaven; and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, all the host of heaven, thou shalt not suffer thyself to be seduced to worship them, and to serve them, which Jehovah thy God hath divided unto all nations under heaven." That the sense of the latter words is not that Jehovah has divided the stars as lights and measurements of time to all the nations under heaven, cannot according to the use of חָלַק in xxix. 25, be doubted. The meaning is that while Israel has the revelation of the true God, the nations of the earth have been left to worship the constellations.

(2) On this, see the doctrine of revelation.

(3) Luther says in his Commentary on Genesis, in reference to this: "Qui extra ista involucra Deum attingere volunt, isti sine scalis nituntur ad cœlum ascendere.—Necesse enim est, ut Deus cum se nobis revelat, id faciat per velamen et involucrum quoddam, et dicat: ecce sub hoc involucro me certe apprehendes."

§ 47.

2. *The Divine Righteousness, Faithfulness and Truth.*

With the Divine holiness in its *ethical* character are connected the attributes of *divine righteousness* and divine *faithfulness* and *truth.* These attributes are united in the main passage, Deut. xxxii. 4. This passage characterizes Jehovah as the rock, that is, as the immovable basis of confidence; and gives the reason for this by pointing to the perfection and unblamableness of the Divine Being and government, in virtue of which God is designated the Truthful and Righteous One. Here we must first consider what is meant by the divine righteousness (צְדָקָה).

God is צַדִּיק. The root-meaning of צדק is (according to the Arabic) "to be straight;" and thus, according to its original meaning, the expression corresponds most nearly with יָשָׁר, with which it is united in the above passage. The word צַדִּיק expresses what is straight and right, in the sense that God in His government always does what is suitable: namely, first, what answers fully to His aim; and secondly, what answers to the constitution of the object of the divine action. Specially, but not exclusively, the sphere in which the צְדָקָה manifests itself is the judicial activity of God. But the divine righteousness, notwithstanding its close connection with divine holiness, has the peculiarity that its sphere of action extends beyond the theocracy and theocratic relations; nay, in one passage in the Old Testament, even the *animals* are comprehended under the government of the divine צדקה, Ps. xxxvi. 7 (2); a declaration on which Jonah iv. 11 sheds light. Still the proper sphere of the righteous government of God is mankind, and this without qualification, even where men stand in no special relation to the divine kingdom. According to Gen. xviii. 25, Jehovah is judge of all the earth, and as such He will do right, and not permit the lot of the godless to fall on the righteous (3). In this connection, in which God gives to every one his due, צַדִּיק appears also in Ex. ix. 27, where Pharaoh says, in giving honor to God's righteousness: "Jehovah is the Righteous One (הַצַּדִּיק), I and my people are the offenders (הָרְשָׁעִים)." This passage and that of Deut. xxxii. 4, from which we started, are the only ones in the Pentateuch in which the righteousness of God is expressly mentioned. The principle of the theocratic ordinances is holiness. Certainly what is said in Isa. v. 16, in reference to the judgment, "The holy God is sanctified by righteousness," must apply in general to the government of God in His kingdom (as presented already in the Pentateuch); all God's deeds which constitute the divine guidance of the kingdom, and bring about the right, the מִשְׁפָּטִים which the Pentateuch sets forth, are thus manifestations of His צְדָקָה. But to specify the צְדָקָה as the attribute which acts in securing the holy aim of His kingdom pertains to prophecy, while the general ethical relations of the divine righteousness are discussed in the Psalms and in the Hebrew Hhokhma.

As in the idea of Jehovah who is absolutely immutable (comp. § 39), so also in the idea of the holy One in virtue of its ethical meaning, the attribute of *truth* and *faithfulness* is given; compare Isa. xlix. 7, יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר נֶאֱמָן; Hos. xi. 9, קְדוֹשִׁים נֶאֱמָן = the faithful All-holy One. Hence God is called אֵל אֱמוּנָה in the above-cited passage in Deut. xxxii. 4, and in Ps. xxxi. 6 אֵל אֱמֶת; and the appellation of God as צוּר, *rock, safe retreat*, in the passage in Deuteronomy refers to this. The antiquity of this last name is indicated by its frequent occurrence in personal names in the Pentateuch: אֱלִיצוּר (my God is a rock), Num. i. 5; צוּרִיאֵל (my rock is God), iii. 35; צוּרִישַׁדַּי (my rock is the Almighty), i. 6; פְּדָהצוּר (the rock redeems), i. 10 (comp. § 88, note 8). In the Old Testament this attribute is specially emphasized in referring to the divine *word of promise*, and the agreement of the divine action therewith. One of the chief passages in the Pentateuch is Num. xxiii. 19; compare 1 Sam. xv. 29, Ps. xxxvi. 6.

(1) Compare Diestel, "Die Idee der Gerechtigkeit, vorzüglich im A. T., biblisch-theologisch dargestellt," *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1860, p. 173 ff. [and Kautsch, *Ueber die Derivate des Stammes* צדק, Tüb. 1881].

(2) [As the different meanings of the derivatives of this root in the Old Testament may be traced back to the idea of conformity to a rule, so also according to Kautsch, the fundamental meaning of the root in Arabic is not, as is usually regarded, "to be straight," but "to be accordant," and so with an external rule, or a matter of fact.]

(3) In this lies an element which is quite essential to the צְדָקָה, namely, that it is always action by *rule and measure.*

§ 48.

3. *The Jealous God.*

Lastly, it is included in the idea of divine holiness that God is a *jealous God,* אֵל קַנָּא (or אֵל קַנּוֹא), Ex. xxxiv. 14 (1); Deut. vi. 15. The divine *zeal* is the *energy of the divine holiness;* this idea stands in the same relation to that of holiness as the idea of אֵל יְיָ to that of Jehovah; hence it is said in Josh. xxiv. 19: "The All-holy God, that is, the אֵל קַנּוֹא." The divine קַנְאָה has a twofold form:

1. It turns itself avengingly against every violation of the divine will. In virtue of His קַנְאָה, the holy God extirpates all that sets itself in opposition to Him. God's jealousy turns especially against idolatry, by which the divine uniqueness is assailed, see *e.g.* Deut. xxxii. 21 (2), and generally against all sin by which God's holy name is desecrated; the El-kanna is פֹּקֵד עָוֹן, Ex. xx. 5 compared with Josh. xxiv. 19. Thus the divine קַנְאָה manifests itself as divine *wrath,* קֶצֶף, אַף, עֶבְרָה, and similar expressions (3). For wrath (as Ullmann has strikingly defined it) is the strong excitement of the voluntative (*wollenden*) spirit in resistance to restraint, and thus the wrath of God is the most intense energy of the holy will of God, the zeal of His wounded love. Compare, on the connection of the two ideas, jealousy and wrath, Deut. vi. 15, xxxii. 21 f., Ps. lxxviii. 58 f. The consuming power of wrath is symbolized by fire; hence in Deut. iv. 24 it is said, "A consuming fire is the אֵל קַנָּא," a fire which burns down to Hades; comp. xxxii. 21 f. The inner essential connection of wrath with the divine holiness is made especially clear by the passage Isa. x. 17: "The Light of Israel becomes a fire, and his Holy One a flame, which burns and consumes his thorns and briers." Because wrath is a manifestation of divine holiness, the occasion of its outburst (as Ritschl and Diestel have rightly urged) does not lie in a capricious divine humor or natural malignity, as the gods of the heathen fall into a passion, but wholly in the person smitten by it. If man denies and rejects the testimony of the holy God which was given to him, justice must be executed upon him in his resistance to God's will, which alone is in the right, by his being reduced to his own nothingness. Breach of the covenant, and the malignant interference with the aim of the covenant, are the offences that chiefly kindle the divine wrath; comp. Ex. xxxii. 10, Num. xxv. 3, Deut. xxxi. 17 in connection with ver. 16. The opposite of the divine wrath is what the Old Testament expresses by נָחַם, הִתְנַחֵם, which literally mean breathing in, fetching one's breath. But the manifestation of wrath also receives its measure from divine holiness, which measure is ordained by the divine aim of salvation, and hence it is not the sway of blind passion; comp. passages like Hos. xi. 9, Jer. x. 24, and the parable Isa. xxviii. 23 ff. (4).

2. Jehovah is jealous not for Himself alone, but also for *His holy people*, so far as they are in a position of grace, or are taken into favor again by Him. From this side the קִנְאָה is the *zeal of love*, as an energetic vindication of the unmatched relation in which God has placed His people to Himself. The idea is found in Deut. xxxii. 36 ff.; but the expression קָנָא לְ, "to be jealous for," is not found till the prophets, Joel ii. 18, Zech. i. 14, viii. 2. On this side also the קִנְאָה is a kindling, but a kindling in pity; comp. Hos. xi. 8, נִכְמְרוּ נִחוּמַי. According to this, God's sparing mercy, חמל, Joel ii. 18, is developed from קִנְאָה. The connection of these notions stands out with special distinctness in Ex. xxxii. ff. When the divine wrath goes out against the people, xxxii. 10, after the first breach of the covenant at Sinai, Moses appeases it, ver. 11 f., by awakening the other side of the divine zeal, inasmuch as it is a point of honor with God as against Egypt to complete the work of redemption begun for the people; and so the manifestation of wrath turns round and makes room for the divine mercy, xxxiv. 6.—The *anthropopathies* of the Old Testament come for the most part under what is here discussed; that is, those declarations concerning God in which human emotions, and changes in these emotions, are attributed to Him. These, in the sense of the Old Testament, are not, like the anthropomorphisms, to be regarded purely as figurative expressions. They actually express *real relations* of God to the world, and are only designated after the analogy of human conditions. If a change of such conditions is spoken of, this means only a change of the *relation* in which the divine holiness, which is in itself changeless, enters to changeable man. And so it can be said, Ps. xviii. 25 f.: "Towards the pious Thou showest Thyself pious; to the upright man Thou showest Thyself upright; towards the pure Thou showest Thyself pure; and to the perverse Thou showest Thyself perverse." The same God whose guidance approves itself to the pious as pure and good, must appear like a malicious power to the perverse whose path He crosses. Especially 1 Sam. xv. shows that the Old Testament does not suppose a change in the divine nature itself. Samuel says, ver. 29: "The Rock of Israel does not deceive, and does not repent of anything; for He is not a man, that He should repent of anything;" and immediately after it is said, ver. 35: "Jehovah repented that He had made Saul king." The anthropopathies serve to keep wakeful and strong the consciousness of the living holy God, the idea of whom man so willingly volatilizes into abstractions.

(1) Ex. xxxiv. 14: "Jehovah, the jealous One, is His name; He is a jealous God."

(2) Deut. xxxii. 21: "They provoked my jealousy, קִנְאוּנִי, by their idols."

(3) The wrath of God has of late years been discussed in several monographs. Comp. Ritschl, *De ira Dei*, 1859, also his *Lehre von der Rechtfertigung* II. 118 ff.; Weber, *Vom Zorne Gottes*, 1862; Bartholomäi, "Vom Zorne Gottes," in the *Jahrbuch. für deutsche Theol.* 1861, p. 256 ff.

(4) Hos. xi. 9: "I will not execute the fierceness of my anger, nor destroy Ephraim again; for I am God and not man, holy in the midst of thee."—Compare further the prophetic part of the book.

SECOND CHAPTER.

THE RELATION OF GOD TO THE WORLD.

§ 49.

General Survey.

The existence of the world as absolutely due to the divine causality is presented in three propositions :—

1. When reflection is directed to the *existence of the world*, both as to its beginning and as to its subsistence, we reach the doctrine of the *creation* and *preservation* of the world.

2. When we consider how the world is so, and not otherwise, we get the doctrine of the *aim* of the world and of divine *providence*, with which is connected the question of the relation of the *divine causality* to the *wickedness* and *evil* in the world.

3. For the realization of His aim, God enters *on a peculiar relation to the world ;* the means by which God brings about this His special relation to the world are exhibited in the doctrine of *revelation.*

FIRST DOCTRINE.—ON THE CREATION AND PRESERVATION OF THE WORLD.

I. ON THE CREATION.

§ 50.

1. *Creation by the Word.*

The Mosaic doctrine of creation rests on the two fundamental thoughts, viz.: that the production of the world proceeded from the *Word* and from the *Spirit of God.*

The form of the creation of the world is the speaking, or the *word* of God ; God *says* that the things shall be, and they are, Gen. i. 3, 6, 9, etc. This means that the *world originated through a conscious, free divine act ;* for the word "said" is simply the utterance of conscious and free will. Hence, in Ps. xxxiii. 9, צִוָּה corresponds to אָמַר ; compare ver. 6, cxlviii. 5, Isa. xlviii. 13, Ps. cxxxv. 6. This excludes, first, every theory of the origin of the world by which the divine being Himself is drawn down into the genesis of the world ; and secondly, the theory according to which the divine productive activity was conditioned at least by something existing originally outside of God, and thereby limited. In the former respect the Old Testament doctrine stands in decided opposition to the theories of emanation in the oriental cosmogonies, in which the creation of the world is made subject to a necessity of nature. The view of the account of the creation, in Gen. i., which seeks to find in it a doctrine of emanation, is quite untenable ; namely, that originally there was nothing but emptiness and voidness, that is, the original substance swallowed up in darkness, and that God, who bore

in Himself the germ of all creation, appears first in ver. 3, and causes it to proceed from Him (1). This view mistakes the connection of ver. 2 with ver. 1, and the Old Testament meaning of ברא. That there is also no notion of the nature of emanation in Ps. xc. 2, in case וַתְּחוֹלֵל as second person refers to God (which is certainly the most probable explanation), is shown by the use of the word in Deut. xxxii. 18, Prov. xxv. 23. The view of the divine creation as generation is purely poetical; comp. also Job xxxviii. 28 f. The divine creation is not a dreamy weaving of the original substance in which it produces the world from itself of necessity, but a conscious, free production (2). It is a fairer subject of discussion whether Genesis, chap. i., does not assume an eternal elementary matter (*ἄμορφος ὕλη*, Wisd. xi. 18) independent of God, and so teach not so much a creator of the world as a shaper of the world—a Demiurge. But even, according to the conception of vers. 1–3 now beginning to find currency, "In the beginning" (רֵאשִׁית as *status constr.*), "when God created heaven and earth;" then ver. 2 as parenthesis, "But the earth was a waste;" ver. 3, "God said, Let there be light"—the passage neither teaches that the creative formation of the cosmos followed on the presupposition of a chaos, nor does it say anything at all about this chaos, whether it proceeded from God or whether it was eternal. For the rest, the construction adopted by this explanation is decidedly contradictory to the thoroughly simple formation of the sentences in the first chapter. But if ver. 1 is understood, according to another view, as a title, a summary statement of the contents of the chapter, still (as Delitzsch remarks) the תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ does not appear as a state without beginning lying behind the work of creation, but the בָּרָא בְּרֵאשִׁית stands at the head of all. The third exposition seems, however, to be the simplest, that ver. 1 is not meant to be a title of the whole, but rather the declaration how a first creation of heaven and earth as *prima materia* preceded the process portrayed from the second verse onwards; compare how Job, xxxviii. 4–7, supposes a *prius* preceding the creation of the earth. By the absolute בְּרֵאשִׁית the divine creation is fixed as an *absolute* beginning, not as a working on something which already existed, and heaven and earth is wholly subjected to the lapse of time, which God transcends; compare Ps. xc. 2, cii. 26. The expression ברא, in agreement with the meaning of its root, which is (בר, פר, compare ברה, פרק, פרע, פרר, פרח, פרש, etc.) "to cleave, divide, separate," might certainly favor the view that only a *shaping* of the world is spoken of; but the *constant use* of ברא in the Old Testament is against this (3), the word being always used to express the production of something new which has not a previous existence, as in Ps. civ. 30 בָּרָא stands parallel to חִדֵּשׁ, to make new. Thus the fact is explained that ברא never appears in speaking of human working, and is never joined with the accusative of the matter out of which anything is created, as is the case with יצר (compare Gen. i. 27 with ii. 7), with עשׂה, and other words of this class. It is clear from this discussion that Mosaism places itself above all natural religions by the declaration, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Hence in Ps. cxxi. 2 Jehovah is called עֹשֵׂה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ; Isa. xlv. 18 says, יהוה בּוֹרֵא הַשָּׁמַיִם הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים יֹצֵר הָאָרֶץ וְעֹשֶׂהָ, He is as such in Gen. xiv. 22, קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ, in which is implied both preparer and possessor of heaven and earth (for the former meaning of קנה, compare Deut. xxxii. 6, Ps. cxxxix. 6). The idea of

creation out of nothing, that is, that God did not produce the world out of anything outside of Himself, is in accordance with the doctrine of Mosaism, and does not, as Ewald strangely supposes, become Old Testament doctrine about the time of Amos (4). How later reflection laid hold of the simple utterances of the record of creation, and carried out farther the thoughts contained in them, is especially shown in Ps. civ. (which is really a commentary on Gen. i.).

(1) Johannsen especially takes this view in his book, *The Cosmogonies of the Indians and Hebrews discussed by comparing the Cosmogonies of Manu and Moses* (in German), 1833.

(2) So far, Ewald has handled the matter very well in his essay, "Erklärung der biblischen Urgeschichte," in his *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.*, vol. i., 1848. He says, p. 80 : "The free creating God of the Old Testament—how different from the heathen god, who has much ado to create, and at length to free himself completely from matter, who has to exert himself in creating, who also creates evil, and has no idea that the creation, as a thing divine and true, must in the last issue be purely good ! The Bible God does not first approach, as it were by chance, the matter already there, or lazily make one substance merely proceed from another ; He is a purely original active Creator, who comprehends everything strictly, and firmly advances forward."

(3) As is acknowledged also by Gesenius in the *Thesaurus*, i. p. 235 f. Comp. also Hitzig, p. 57 f.

(4) Ewald thinks, *l.c.* p. 85, that when God is represented as having formed the mountains (Amos iv. 13 compared with Ps. xc. 2), the old chaos is hereby abolished, and the activity of the Creator extended as far as possible. Comp. also *Lehre von Gott*, p. 39 ff.

§ 51.

2. *The Divine Spirit in the Creation.*

Since the world is placed outside of God, it originated and subsists only by the life imparted to it by His Spirit ; thus it is not *separated* from Him, although *distinct* from Him.

Because the world is called into being by a free divine act, and so is other than God, its life is not a life of God in it, but yet is a life imparted to it out of the divine fulness of life. This lies in the doctrine of the Divine רוּחַ (1). The life of the creature, according to the record of creation, does not proceed from the chaotic mass ; but life comes from the God, who in Ps. xxxvi. 10 [A. V. v. 9] is called in general the fountain of life (מְקוֹר חַיִּים), to the matter created by Him. According to Gen. i. 2, the Spirit of God acts on the *prima materia*, on the chaotic earth ; it hovers (מְרַחֶפֶת) over the earth. The meaning "to brood," which is here given to רִחֵף by many expositors, cannot be proved from Deut. xxxii. 11, as there the word stands rather in the meaning of a hovering flight ; but it appears in the Syriac, and certainly a reference to the mother's life-giving activity may be found in רחף, which is connected with רחם (2). But that the Spirit of God, as imparting life, is not only a physical power, and is not separated from the word as an expression of will, but really acts in the creative word, and that therefore is itself endued with the power of life, is indicated by the expression in Ps. xxxiii. 6, where the Spirit is characterized as the Spirit of the divine mouth ; it lies also in Isa. xl. 13, that the Divine Spirit acting in

the creation is a consciously working, an intelligent power, as, according to Ps. cxxxix. 7, the divine omnipresence in the world acts by means of the all penetrating Spirit of God. It is this Divine Spirit (comp. § 70) which, as נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים, (the breath of life) is breathed into man by a special act (Gen. ii. 7 ; comp. Job xxvii. 3), and from which all creature-life continually proceeds (Ps. civ. 29 f.; comp. Job xii. 10) (3). The doctrine of the creative word guards this derivation of creature life from the divine source against being understood as a doctrine of emanation ; as also do the expressions, יְצֹר רוּחַ־אָדָם בְּקִרְבּוֹ, Zech xii. 1 ; רוּחַ־אֵל עָשָׂתְנִי, Job xxxiii. 4. Creature life proceeds from God, but it does not flow from God ; it is imparted freely by God to the creature ; comp. Isa. xlii. 5 ("He who giveth the רוּחַ"). It is not a life which God lives in the creature, but a relatively independent life of the creature, derived from God, which is taught in these passages.

(1) On this subject we have a thorough monograph by Kleinert, "Zur alttest. Lehre vom Geiste Gottes," *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1867, p. 3 ff.

(2) The fundamental signification of רָחַף seems to be, "to be soft ;" it occurs in Kal, in Jer. xxiii. 9, with the meaning "to be lax" ; in Piel it means, "to let oneself down gently."

(3) Thus orginate the רוּחוֹת לְכָל־בָּשָׂר (Num. xvi. 22), in which, however, the one Spirit of God is immanent in the creatures. Because the Old Testament does not pause at the multiplicity of the רוּחוֹת, but refers them back to the One Spirit, the doctrine of the Spirit of God is, as Kleinert (*l.c.* p. 8 ff.) says, the most powerful vehicle of the Old Testament monotheistic view of the world.

II. ON THE PRESERVATION OF THE WORLD.

§ 52.

The preservation of the world is, on the one hand, distinguished in the Old Testament from its creation ; while, on the other hand, the agency of God in this preservation is represented as a *continuous creation*.

1. The preservation is distinguished from the creation of the world even in the account of the creation, inasmuch as, according to Gen. ii. 2, the production of the classes of creatures has a conclusion, which is formed by the Sabbath of creation (1). A certain independence is conferred on the living beings called into existence by the creation, by the power of reproduction, Gen. i. 11, xxii. 28 ; the continuance of the system of the world is pledged by the covenant with Noah, Gen. viii. 21. On this world-covenant rest the חֻקּוֹת שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ, Jer. xxxiii. 25, compared with vers. 20 and 21, 36, to which "ordinances of heaven and earth" the course of the world is bound, Ps. cxlviii. 6 (2). In connection with the laws by which the duration of each sphere of existence is ordained, compare also such passages as Jer. v. 22, Ps. civ. 9, Job xxxviii. 10, xiv. 5.

2. The continuance of this system of the world is established at each moment by the divine omnipotence ; the relative independence of the creature is ever an independence lent to it. *The preservation of the world rests continually on the same foundation as the creation*, viz., on God's *word of command*, which He utters continually, or, as it is also expressed, *sends forth* (compare, besides the

passages already cited above, which also bear on this point, Ps. cxlvii. 5, xxxiii. 9, and in particular Ps. cxlvii. 15–18) (3) ; and it rests just as continually on the Divine Spirit, which He causes ever to go forth. The main passage for this divine communication of the Spirit which continues in the preservation of the world is again Ps. civ. 29 f.: "Thou takest away their (the creatures') spirit, and they die, and turn again to their dust ; Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, and they are created ; and Thou renewest the form of the earth." This passage shows how the preservation of the creature can be looked at from the point of view of a *creatio continua ;* and this thought, that a creative working of God goes on in the preservation of creation, is in general imprinted in various forms on the Old Testament phraseology ; compare, for example, Ex. iv. 11, Isa. xlii. 5. The Psalm of creation also (Ps. civ.), by using participles in ver. 2, characterizes the creative agency of God as an agency which continues to work in the preservation of the world (4).—On this side, and as far as the creature is conditioned and supported in each moment of its existence by the divine activity, it is in itself *empty* and *perishable*, and as such the living creature is called *flesh*, בָּשָׂר, in distinction from the divine spirit of life ; comp. Gen. vi. 3, 13, Isa. xl. 6 ; and for the contrast of בָּשָׂר and רוּחַ in general, the passage Isa. xxxi. 3. Even the heaven and earth, although their duration is assured to them, are not eternal in the sense in which God is eternal, but are subject to change : "They shall decay, and Thou endurest ; they all wax old like a garment ; as a vesture Thou changest them, and they are changed. But Thou art the same, and Thy years have no end." Ps. cii. 27 f. (5).

(1) Gen. ii. 3 : "And God completed on the seventh day His work which He had made." This seemed strange to the Alexandrians, because man, the last creature, was called into being on the sixth day, and so they altered it boldly to *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῃ*. But in doing this they showed that they did not understand what is said in regard to the meaning of the seventh day. It is the seventh day *qui finem imponit*, which puts as it were the conclusion to the creation.

(2) Ps. cxlviii. 6 : "He set them firmly to eternity and eternity ; He gave laws, and they (the heavenly bodies) do not overstep them."

(3) In Ps. cxlvii. 15–18, snow, hoar frost, ice, etc., are referred to the divine word of command sent forth on the earth.

(4) Ex. iv. 11 : "Who made man's mouth ? or who maketh dumb, or deaf, or seeing, or blind ?" The change to the imperfect יָשׂוּם indicates that the divine activity is a continuous one.—Isa. xlii. 5 : "He who createth the heaven (participle בּוֹרֵא) and spreadeth it out, who extendeth the earth and its offspring, who giveth breath to the people upon it."—Ps. civ. 2 : "He covereth Himself with light as a garment, and spreadeth out the heaven as a covering."

(5) The Old Testament Hhokhma gives a further development of these *theologumena*. There, in distinction from the Pentateuch, the divine *wisdom* is regarded as the principle of the formation of the world. The later books of the Old Testament are here referred to only so far as they do not go beyond the doctrine of Mosaism, but only illustrate it.

SECOND DOCTRINE.—THE DIVINE AIM OF THE WORLD. DIVINE PROVIDENCE.

§ 53.

The Design of Creation, and its Realization through Providence.

That a divine *plan* is to be realized in the world, and that the divine creation is therefore a teleological act, is shown in the *account of the creation*, partly and in general in the progress of creation according to a definite plan, and partly in particular in the divine sanction, "and God saw that it was good," following each step of creation, and in the divine blessing pronounced on every living being. Each class of beings in the world in particular, and then, Gen. i. 31, the world as a whole, is the object of divine approval, because corresponding to the divine aim. In all His creating God approves the works of His hands; but still the creating God does not reach the goal of His creation until He has set over against Him His image in man. From this last fact it is plain that the *self-revelation* of God, the unveiling of His being, is the final end of the creation of the world; or, to express it more generally, that the whole world serves to reveal the divine *glory* (כָּבוֹד), and is thereby the object of divine joy, Ps. civ. 31. The Old Testament view of nature rests on this fundamental conception; but the Pentateuch, of course, is not the place for a fuller statement of this. From this point of view, the creature, which in itself is nothing, possesses in its relation to God a high significance as the object of His imparted goodness, and as the means for the revelation of His glory (comp. Ps. civ. 28, cxlv. 9, 15 f.). But in mankind the aim of the [creation of the] world, the glorifying of God, was disturbed by *sin;* and therefore in the song of praise on the glory of the creation, Ps. civ., the wish is expressed in ver. 35: "May sinners have an end on the earth, and the godless be no more." By sin the sway of the divine spirit of life is repressed, Gen. vi. 3; and through man's sin the curse falls on the other creatures of the earth that are set in dependence on him, v. 29, and the world becomes the object of divine judgment. But in spite of this, the continuance of the terrestrial order is assured in the world-covenant, viii. 21, ix. 11, which shows that, in spite of the dominion of sin, the divine aim in the world shall come to its realization, as, Num. xiv. 21, Jehovah swears in the midst of His people's revolt: "As truly as I live, the whole earth shall be filled with the glory of Jehovah." The choosing of the race through which God's blessing shall come on all races of the earth, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, serves this divine aim. The whole Pentateuchal history of revelation, as exhibited in our first section, is nothing but the activity of that divine *providence* which, in order to the realization of the divine aim, is at once directed to the whole, Deut. xxxii. 8 (comp. § 22 with note 1), and at the same time proves itself efficacious in the direction of the life of separate men, and in the guiding of all circumstances, especially in regard to all human helplessness (comp. in particular passages from Genesis, such as xxi. 17, xxviii. 15, xxxii. 11, xlv. 5–7, l. 20) (1). There was no special occasion in the Pentateuch to speak of the operation of the divine providence outside the sphere of the history of revelation. But it is clear that the Old Testament teaches a provi-

dence which embraces everything, since it subjects everything to the divine direction : "Thou that hearest prayer, all flesh cometh to Thee," Ps. lxv. 2 ; and therefore in the same psalm, ver. 6, God is called "the confidence of all the ends of the earth, and of the sea and of those that are far off." The divine providence extends also to the *animals*. They all wait on God, that He may give them their food at the right time, Ps. civ. 27 ; the lions that roar after their prey seek their food from God, ver. 21 ; the ravens call on God, Job xxxviii. 41, Ps. cxlvii. 9, etc.—No sphere of *chance* exists in the Old Testament ; compare Ex. xxi. 13 (2). It is characteristic, that a distinction between chance (מִקְרֶה) and divine decree occurs in the Old Testament only in the mouth of the heathen Philistines, 1 Sam. vi. 9. Even in drawing lots there rules no chance, Prov. xvi. 33 (3); and so in Num. xxvi. 55 f., Josh. vii. 14 ff., xiv. 2, 1 Sam. xiv. 41, the lot is used in seeking to know the divine will (comp. § 97).

(1) Compare further especially the Angelology.

(2) It is said in Ex. xxi. 12, "He who strikes a man that he die, shall die." Now ver. 13 says : "But if he did not do it of design, but God permitted it to meet his hand (הָאֱלֹהִים אִנָּה לְיָדוֹ)." Thus even what men call accidental death is under God's direction. Baumgarten-Crusius says, curiously enough, that in this place the word *God* means no more than circumstances.

(3) Prov. xvi. 33 : "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposal thereof comes from Jehovah."

§ 54.

Relation of the Divine Causality to Moral and Physical Evil.

Moral and physical evil were not originally in the world. The latter was penally ordained (Gen. iii. 17 ff.) after the former had entered the world by the free act of man, and from this time forward both form an element of the divine order of the world.

1. The point of view under which *physical evil* in man's life is placed is thoroughly *ethical*, and mainly that evil is *punishment for sin*, or divine judgment (1). In the Pentateuch it is taught that the evil in man's life is also a means of proving him, especially of *proving his obedience* and his trust in God, and thus a means of purifying him ; and that even merited suffering must in this way tend to the salvation of man. These thoughts are expressed in the providential history of the lives of Jacob and Joseph, but it is especially the providential leading of the people in the wilderness, which in the Pentateuch is contemplated from this point of view ; compare, as chief passage, Deut. viii. 2 f. (2). According to this, the privations endured in the wilderness were meant to be a school of humility and faith, that the people might learn to trust to the power of the all-mighty God. To the same purpose we read in ver. 16 of the same chapter, that this leading through the wilderness served "to humble thee and to try thee, and to do thee good in the end ;" compare also Judg. ii. 22, and other passages.

2. But also, even in *moral evil*, in man's sin, the divine causality operates, and this it does in various ways.—Man's sin *cannot thwart the divine purpose* of salvation ; it must rather serve to the realization thereof (Gen. l. 20, comp. xlv. 8) (3).

The wickedness of some must serve to prove and purify *others*, that it may be known whether they are strong to stand against it. The main passage is Deut. xiii. 3, where it is said that God even permits false prophets to be in the community, and even lets their signs take place, although they seek to lead the people away to other gods: "For Jehovah, your God, tries you, to know whether ye love Jehovah, your God, with your whole heart and your whole soul." Nay, in order to punish and humble a man, God even permits another to wrong him; this David acknowledges, when he says, on being cursed by Shimei (2 Sam. xvi. 11), "Jehovah has said unto him, Curse David." But a divine causality works also in (*i.e.* in regard to) the *sinner himself*, and for various ends; God *permits* one who habitually walks in God's ways to fall into sin, in order to try him, to *reveal to him a hidden curse in his heart*, and so to bring to its issue a merited judgment, and thus bring God's justice to light. To this belong cases like that in 2 Sam. xxiv. (the numbering of the people); compare passages such as Ps. li. 6, 2 Chron. xxxii. 31. On another, who intentionally cherishes sin within him, and wilfully strives against God, the divine causality acts by *giving him up to sin*, so that sinning becomes necessary to this man, and he must glorify God by the judgment which he has incurred. This is the *hardening of the heart* of a man, so often spoken of in the Pentateuch: Ex. iv. 21, vii. 3; Deut. ii. 30, etc. Pharaoh and the Canaanite tribes are especially the types of this hardening. In reference to such examples, it is said in Prov. xvi. 4, that Jehovah has made all things for His own ends; also the evil-doer for the day of calamity. Ex. ix. 16 serves especially to explain this passage. God could at once have annihilated Pharaoh and his people (ver. 15); but "I have set thee there," that Pharaoh may experience Jehovah's might, and that His name may be glorified in the whole earth. With this compare Ps. ii. 4, Isa. xviii. 4. But the presupposition of all hardening of the heart is, that God, as the long-suffering One, אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם awaits the ripening of wickedness; see the case Gen. xv. 16. The expressions used to denote hardening of the heart cannot be referred to a simply negative relation to wickedness; but still man's sin is not removed because a positive divine agency rules in his hardening. Man can indeed do nothing that would not on one side be God's work (see Lam. iii. 37 f.), and yet he must acknowledge sin as his guilt (ver. 39). Isa. xlv. 7—a passage possibly directed against the dualism of the Persian religion—shows especially how the monism of the Old Testament permitted nothing to be withdrawn from the divine causality (4).

(1) Compare the particulars on this further on, in the doctrine of death and in the doctrine of retribution.

(2) Deut. viii. 2 f.: "Jehovah thy God hath led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee and to try thee (לְנַסֹּתֶךָ), to know what is in thy heart, whether thou wilt regard His commands or not. He humbled thee, and caused thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, to cause thee to know that man doth not live by bread alone; but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live."—In this lie the germs of the thoughts which form the theme of the book of Job.

(3) Gen. l. 20: "Ye meant evil against me; but God meant it for good, to do as it is this day, and to save alive this people." So Joseph (xlv. 8) could say to his brothers, "It was not ye who sent me hither, but God."

(4) Lam. iii. 37 f.: "Who speaketh, and it cometh to pass, without God hav-

ing commanded it? Out of the mouth of the Most High should not evil come as well as good? Ver. 39. Why doth man murmur at his life? let every one murmur over his sins."—Isa. xlv. 7: "Who forms light and creates darkness, makes peace and produces evil; I Jehovah do all this."—Here we have only to do with the simple lines of thought; compare, further on, the doctrine of sin (§ 76), and the fuller development of these doctrines in the later parts of Old Testament theology.

THIRD DOCTRINE.—OF REVELATION.

§ 55.

Introductory Remark and General View.

Inasmuch as the whole universe, nature and history, serve a divine aim, and the manifestation of the divine glory is all comprehensive (comp. § 53), man, as has been shown in the Introduction (§ 6), can know God even from the light of nature. But we have now to do with *revelation in a more limited sense*, and to answer the question, How, according to the Old Testament, God sets Himself forth to man by testimony which he gives of Himself! The answer to this falls into the following parts:—

1. Although God, in the transcendental fulness of His being, is incomprehensible to man, He is nevertheless pleased to enter into the limits of the sphere of the creature, in order to present Himself personally, and to give testimony of Himself to man. This *side of the revelation of the Divine Being* is characterized as the divine *name*, the divine *presence*, the divine *glory* (כָּבוֹד).

2. The forms and vehicles in which this divine self-presentation and self-witness reaches man *from without* are the *voice*, the *Malakh* [A. V. Angel], the *Shekhina* in the sanctuary, and *miracle*. The divine self-witness enters the *heart* of man by means of the *Spirit*. The latter form of revelation appears first after the founding of the theocracy (not in Genesis); it unfolds itself in proportion as the outward theophany disappears, but its main sphere is only found in prophecy, and therefore this subject must be treated but briefly here, and in detail in the doctrine of prophecy (1).

(1) It is quite the same with the course of revelation in the New Testament, as Stier has very correctly pointed out. Christophanies continue for some time after the ascension of our Lord; then they disappear and make room for the revelation of the Lord in the inwardness of the spirit.

I. ON THE REVELATION OF THE DIVINE BEING.

§ 56.

The Divine Name (1).

The most general designation of the Divine Being as revealed, is the Divine *name*, which, as one of the fundamental conceptions in the Old Testament, demands a particular examination. It is true in general, and so also in regard to God, that *every* name presupposes a manifestation of what is to be named; and on the other hand, what closes itself against knowledge is, as such, a thing that

cannot be named, an *ἀκατονόμαστον*. Man can imagine names for false gods, but the true God can be named by man only so far as He reveals Himself to man and discloses to him His nature. The name of God is first *nomen editum*, and then *nomen inditum* (2). Now, God does not name Himself to man after the compass of His perfections, as the earlier theology was wont inexactly to define the biblical notion of the divine name, but according to the relation in which He has placed Himself to man, according to the attributes by which He wishes to be acknowledged, known, and addressed by man, in the communion into which He has entered with him. In short, God names Himself, not according to what He is for Himself, but to *what He is for man;* and therefore every self-presentation of God in the world is expressed by a corresponding name of God, as we have already seen (3). But the biblical notion of the divine name is not exhausted by this. It is not merely the title which God bears in virtue of the relation in which he places Himself to man ; but the expression "name of God" designates at the same time the whole divine self-presentation by which God in personal presence testifies of Himself—*the whole side of the divine nature which is turned toward man.* Be it understood, the divine name is not everywhere present where there is a working of divine power ; but everywhere where the God of revelation, as such, gives Himself to be recognized in His acts so as to be confessed and invoked. Accordingly the name of God is certainly (as Otto, *Dekalogische Untersuchungen*, p. 81, rightly says) not the *ideal* existence of God in the consciousness of the created spirit, but an objective existence, independent of man's subjectivity. But this power of God within the world, and objective to man, is a name of God only in so far as it offers itself to be named by man and comes to him in the form of revelation, that is, in as far as man *can* know of it. Whether he *will* know of it is another matter ; for man may deny and profane the name of God, the divine self-presentation which has reached him. Now the Israelite who knows his covenant God as the creator and supporter of the universe, does of course recognize God's name, God's self-presentation in the whole course of nature ; and therefore it is said in Ps. viii. 2, "How glorious is thy *name* in all the earth !" (הוֹד in the second hemistich corresponds to שֵׁם). Still the divine name—and this is its exclusive use in the Pentateuch—conducts us specially into the sphere of the divine kingdom ; it designates every *manifestation* of the Divine Being which attaches to places, institutions, and facts, in virtue of which God gives His people a direct experience of Himself. The following are the principal passages :—Of the Malakh, in which is the divine *presence* (countenance), it is said in other words that the divine name is within him (Ex. xxiii. 21 ; comp. § 59, 8) ; the dwelling of the divine *glory* in the sanctuary (§ 62), by which God gives experience of His presence there, is called a dwelling of His name in this place, Deut. xii. 5, xi. 14, 23 f., 1 Kings viii. 29, compare Jer. iii. 17 (hence the service there is a שְׁרַת בְּשֵׁם יהוה, Deut. xviii. 5, 7). If, as has been done by many, and even by Winer, who is usually so exact (in his *Hebrew Lexicon*), we simply explain the Old Testament expression, that God puts His name in a place, or causes it to dwell there, *locum eligere, ubi sacris solennibus colatur*, the consequences which are connected with the dwelling of the divine name are mistaken for the thing itself. According to the Old Testament view, there is in such cases something more than an ideal symbolical presence of God in

the sanctuary, for fearful expressions of God's presence proceed from the sanctuary, *e. g.* Lev. x. 2, etc.—So, then, wherever God is known and experienced in *personal presence*, there His name is. He *sends forth* His word, but where His name is, there He presents Himself; and therefore the phrase, "*Thy name* is called over us," in Jer. xiv. 9, is only a further explanation of the declaration, "*Thou* art in the midst of us" (4).—The reality which this gives to the name of God may be made more distinct by a few further examples. When Isaiah (chap. xxx. 27) sees the Lord approach in judgment, he says: "See, Jehovah's *name* cometh from afar, His wrath burning," etc. (5). The Psalmist prays (Ps. liv. 3): "Help me by Thy *name*," and this corresponds to "by Thy strength" (בִּגְבוּרָתְךָ); compare Jer. x. 6: "Thy *name* is great in power" (בַּגְּבוּרָה) (as in 1 Kings viii. 42 the strong *hand* and the outstretched *arm* correspond to the great *name*). Hence it is said in Prov. xviii. 10: "The name of Jehovah is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it, and is safe" (6).

(1) Compare my article, "Name, biblische Bedeutung desselben," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* x. p. 193 ff.

(2) Therefore אֱלֹהִים, which in its original meaning designates divinity in general, looked at apart from God's historical witness to Himself, is not regarded in the Old Testament as properly a *name* of God (comp. § 41), [also Cremer, *New Testament Lexicon*].

(3) The God who causes the forsaken Hagar to know by experience that His all-seeing eye overlooks no helpless one, receives immediately the name, the *God of vision*, Gen. xvi. 13 (comp. § 42 with note 1). The characteristic of the patriarchal stage of revelation appears in the name of God, *El-shaddai*, Gen. xvii. 1 (comp. § 37), which name corresponds to the change of the name Abram to Abraham, xvii. 5; Shaddai [almighty] there designating God as Him who subjects nature to the purpose of His revelation by His powerful sway, mainly in reference to the fact that a numerous offspring was to be given to the childless Abraham. In the same way, God's relation to the patriarchs is presented in the name, "*the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*," Ex. iii. 6 (comp. § 25). The further stage of the revelation which began with the redemption of Israel from Egypt is distinctly indicated in the disclosure of the meaning of the name *Jehovah*, Ex. iii. 15 ff., vi. 2 ff. (comp. § 40). The name קָדוֹשׁ appears with the founding of the theocracy (comp. § 44). When God reveals Himself in His *grace, mercy*, and *long-suffering* after the first breach of the covenant, this is again connected with a manifestation of the corresponding name, Ex. xxxiv. 6 (comp. § 29). In the *New Testament* stage, when the only-begotten Son, has revealed God's name to man (John xvii. 6), it is God's good pleasure to be named the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, or, to express universally the now completed relation of salvation, by the name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* (Matt. xxviii. 19).

(4) For this reason, in Deut. xxviii. 10 the fact that God raises Israel to be a people holy to Him, and standing in His revealing fellowship, is expressed by saying that God's name is named on the people. God's name is great and glorious in the redemption of His people and the institution of the covenant, Ps. cxi. 9 (note also the correlation of notions in Isa. xliii. 7). Israel walks in the *name* of his God in an objective sense, in so far as he experiences the effective power of the God who manifests Himself in his midst (hence, Zech. x. 12, וְנִבְרַתִּים בַּיהוָה precedes בְּשֵׁמוֹ יִתְהַלָּכוּ); and in a subjective sense, in so far as he acknowledges his God in accordance with this in word and conduct, and fears His name in fulfilling his law, Deut. xxviii. 58. Mic. iv. 5, a passage frequently misunderstood, is to be interpreted conformably. The prophecy that in future time all nations shall go in pilgrimage to Zion, there to receive the law, has its basis in this, that Israel walks in the name of Jehovah, that is, stands in communion with the true God,

who manifests Himself among His people; while the other nations (although they also stand under the power of the true God, yet as long as they do not acknowledge it as the power of this God) walk in the name of their gods, and as belonging to them.—The aim of the divine kingdom is, that the name of the true God shall be named also upon the remnant of the heathen people who are rescued from judgment, Amos ix. 12 (comp. Mal. i. 11); that is, that they shall be brought into the communion of His revelation, while He assumes toward them the relation of a king, Zech. xiv. 9, the consequence of which shall be that they on their side shall acknowledge and call on the name of Jehovah (Zeph. iii. 9).

(5) With this compare Isa. xxvi. 8: "We await Thee in the path of Thy judgments; the desire of our soul is after Thy *name* and Thy remembrance."

(6) Compare Ps. xx. 2, xliv. 6: "Through Thy name we tread down our adversaries," cxxiv. 8, etc. When God causes His people to experience His powerful presence by miracles, it is said, "Thy name is near," Ps. lxxv. 2; where Hengstenberg seeks incorrectly to give the expression a subjective turn. God gives honor to His name, Ps. cxv. 1, and sanctifies it, etc., when He proves Himself to be the true God by demonstrations of His power and glory; and, on the other hand, anything from which it might appear as if the might and glory of the God of Israel were naught—for example, the permanent rejection of His people,—would be a desecration of His name in an objective sense, Ezek. xx. 14, 22. The divine name is subjectively hallowed by man when he gives due acknowledgment of the self-witness and self-presentation of God in the world. On the other hand, the divine name is desecrated by men when they treat the divine self-witness, and that with which it is connected,—in short, what is most real,—as a thing of naught and powerless, which man may neglect without punishment, in words (Ex. xx. 7), or in deeds, (comp. the תָּפַשׂ שֵׁם, Prov. xxx. 9).—God guides the pious for His name's sake, Ps. xxiii. 3, xxxi. 4; He lends assistance for His name's sake, Ps. cix. 21, cxliii. 4; 11; He remits guilt for His name's sake, Ps. xxv. 11, compare ciii. 1 ff.; inasmuch as He cannot be at variance with what He has represented and manifested Himself to be. The various other connections in which "in the *name* of God" occurs, are explained by what has been already discussed. In an objective sense, the expression designates, in God's strength and authority, and as His representative (comp. Mic. v. 3, where "in the majesty of the name of Jehovah" corresponds to בְּעֹז יהוה, as Acts iv. 7 ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει stands beside ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι, Deut. xviii. 18 ff.). To this, then, corresponds the subjective meaning, the naming and acknowledging of God as that power in which one speaks and acts, for whose cause one suffers, etc.

§ 57.

2. *The Divine Countenance and the Divine Glory.*

That by which God is present among His people is further styled the *divine countenance* [A. V. presence] (פָּנִים). Ex. xxxiii. 14 ff. is the main passage. Jehovah had declared, in ver. 2 f. of this chapter, that He Himself would no more go in the midst of the stiffnecked people, but would cause them to be guided by an angel (namely, a subordinate angel). Afterwards He permits Himself to be entreated by Moses, and says, פָּנַי יֵלֵכוּ, "my countenance shall go." This certainly means, He Himself will go (comp. xxxiv. 9). Still the divine countenance is not identical with the divine essence; for while (according to the passages cited in § 46) the latter must be conceived as without form and exempt from every limitation of space, it follows from xxxiii. 20 that the divine פָּנִים is in itself visible, only that a human eye is not able to bear the sight (compare Gen. xxxii. 31). The contradiction, that the divine countenance is not visible to man, while yet

we read in the same chapter (Ex. xxxiii. 11) of Moses speaking with God face to face (פָּנִים אֶל־פָּנִים), and in Num. xii. 8 mouth to mouth (פֶּה אֶל־פֶּה), and also in the latter passage that Moses saw Jehovah's form (תְּמֻנַת יְהוָה),—this contradiction is solved by understanding "countenance" in the latter passage in a merely relative sense, as appears from the connection (compare also Num. xiv. 14, "eye to eye"). Moses receives a view of the reflex of the divine form (Ex. xxxiii. 23).

From all this it is clear that by the face of God is meant, in distinction from His transcendent and infinite nature, His *coming down into the sphere of the created, whereby He can be brought within the immediate knowledge of man.* Here belongs, further, Deut. iv. 37, where it is said that Jehovah brought Israel out of Egypt by His countenance (בְּפָנָיו). [i. e. by the might of his presence : A. V. incorrectly "in his sight."—D]. Hence also the *Malakh* by whom Jehovah redeems His people—the same in whom, as we have already observed, the divine name was—is called, Isa. lxiii. 9, the angel of the divine countenance ; compare how, in Gen. xxxii. 30 f., the divine countenance stands for the manifestation of God, Hos. xii. 4, which Hosea, ver. 5, refers to the *Malakh* [angel]. Only from this, too, is the full meaning of the high priest's blessing rightly understood, Num. vi. 25 f.: "Jehovah cause His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious to thee ; Jehovah lift up His countenance on thee, and give thee peace," which is characterized in ver. 27 as the laying of God's name on Israel. Here, too, we have not something merely symbolical, but a definite experience of God's gracious presence and aid proceeding from the real dwelling of God in Israel ; as, conversely, the manifestation of Jehovah's countenance brings destruction on His enemies (Ps. xxi. 10), and the hiding of the divine countenance shows a withdrawal of God's gracious presence. On the other hand, Ps. cxxxix. 7, "Where shall I flee from Thy face ?" corresponding to "Where shall I go from Thy Spirit ?" goes beyond the theocratic relation. Here the expression "the divine countenance" clearly teaches that God's omnipresence, which by means of the Spirit interpenetrates the universe, is everywhere a personal presence of God.

Finally, for name and countenance the indefinite expression, *glory* (כְּבוֹד יהוה) is used ; so Ex. xxxiii. 17 ff., where it alternates with פָּנִים. In the same way, it is כְּבוֹד יְהוָה through which Jehovah appears to His people on Mount Sinai, under covert of the cloud (Ex. xxiv. 16), and which is present in the holy tabernacle (xl. 34). In this respect 1 Kings viii. is especially clear : earth and the heaven of heavens cannot contain God (ver. 27) ; but His glory (ver. 11), for which His *name* is put in ver. 29, is present in the sanctuary.

II. THE FORMS OF REVELATION.

§ 58.

The Divine Voice.

As divine speech is in general the form of divine working in the world, so the *word* is the most general form of divine revelation. Compare, for example, how in Ps. cxlvii. 18 f. the word of God acting in nature, and the divine word of revelation are placed over against one another. Hence the formula, "the word of Jehovah came to," or similar forms, frequently recur from Gen. xv. 1 onward.

Now, so far as this word of God comes internally to the organs of revelation, it coincides with the revelation which is effected by the Spirit (compare § 65). But the Old Testament specifies among its mediums of revelation also the outwardly audible *voice* (קוֹל); indeed, in Deut. iv. 12, special weight is laid upon this form of revelation: "Jehovah spoke to you out of the fire; ye heard (קוֹל דְּבָרִים) a sound of words, but ye saw no form, זוּלָתִי קוֹל" [except a voice], in which קוֹל is placed in opposition to תְּמוּנָה. Thus also, 1 Sam. iii. 4, 1 Kings xix. 11 ff., the voice is the material substratum of the theophany.

With this was connected in the later Jewish theology the doctrine of the *Bath-kol*, or revelation by means of heavenly voices, such as Elijah received,—a form of revelation which was supposed to continue in the time of the second temple, after prophecy had grown dumb. The expression "daughter of the voice" means that the divine voice itself is not heard, but only its working, since either קוֹל was understood as a divine attribute, and בַּת קוֹל as its manifestation (as was done by the Cabbalists); or, according to the common acceptation, קוֹל designates the heavenly voice itself, and בַּת קוֹל its echo. This form of revelation appears in the *New Testament* in Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5, John xii. 28; and very frequently in the Apocalypse.

§ 59.

The Doctrine of the Angel of the Lord, of the Covenant, of the Countenance (1). *The Exegetical State of the Case.*

In a more concrete form God manifests Himself in the מַלְאָךְ, generally called מַלְאַךְ יהוה (comp. § 41), or מַלְאַךְ הָאֱלֹהִים, or simply הַמַּלְאָךְ; in the Elohistic section (Gen. xxi. 17) מַלְאַךְ אֱלֹהִים, (and in 1 Sam. xxix. 9, in the mouth of the Philistine Achish). This Malakh is in part identified with Jehovah, and again in part distinguished from Him. It is above all things necessary, on this important and difficult point, to examine carefully the principal passages (2).

1. Gen. xvi. 7 ff., the מַלְאָךְ appears to Hagar, and says (ver. 10): "I will multiply thy seed." Now in ver. 11 Jehovah is spoken of in the third person; but we read in ver. 13 that Jehovah spoke to Hagar, and Hagar named Him that appeared to her "the God of seeing." With this compare how (xxi. 17) אֱלֹהִים and מַלְאַךְ אֱלֹהִים are used alternately.

2. Among the three men who appeared to Abraham (chap. xviii.), one is expressly distinguished as Jehovah (vers. 20, 26, etc.) from the two others, who are called מַלְאָכִים, and are said (xix. 13) to be sent by Jehovah. But the intercourse between these two and Lot (xix. 18 ff.) is carried on, and the account runs, exactly as if Jehovah Himself stood there. Now it may be disputed, whether Jehovah is also represented by these two angels, or whether Jehovah is to be supposed to have rejoined them after Lot has been led out of the town (ver. 18), even though it is not expressly mentioned. The latter conception appears to me (in opposition to Delitzsch, Keil, and others) to be the right one (so Stier).

3. Gen. xxii. 12, the מַלְאַךְ יהוה calls to Abraham from heaven, as if he were God Himself, "Now I know," etc., and Abraham himself receives (ver. 14) the manifestation as a manifestation of Jehovah; on the contrary, ver. 15 ff. may again be

understood as if the Malakh were distinguished from Jehovah: "I swear by my self, saith Jehovah."

4. Gen. xxiv. 7, comp. ver. 40, Abram says to his servant, "Jehovah, the God of heaven, . . send His angel before thee." Thus the angel of Jehovah—for it is clear that a particular one is meant—is distinguished from Jehovah, as in the theophany at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 12 f.) the מַלְאָכִים are distinguished from Jehovah. But (xxxi. 12–13) the Malakh that appeared to Jacob says, "I am the God of Bethel;" while, on the other side (xxxv. 7), the plural נִגְלוּ הָאֱלֹהִים may be so understood that the angels that appeared belong to the *theophany*.

5. The apparition at night with which Jacob wrestles (chap. xxxii.) is designated (vers. 29–31) as an appearance of God (אלהים), or more exactly, as the appearing of the divine countenance (פָּנִים); Hosea (chap. xii. 4) treats this in like manner as a manifestation of God, but immediately (ver. 5) substitutes מַלְאָךְ for אֱלֹהִים.

6. Gen. xlviii. 15 f. is especially remarkable. Jacob blesses his sons with the words: "The God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, the God who has been my shepherd till this day, the Malakh who delivered me from every evil, let Him bless these lads."

7. In Ex. iii. 2 the מַלְאַךְ יהוה appears to Moses in the flame, in ver. 4 Jehovah and Elohim are substituted for him, and now in ver. 6 He says: "I am the God of thy father;" and the whole of the following relation intentionally conveys the impression of converse between Jehovah and Moses.

8. In Ex. xiii. 21 it is said: "Jehovah went before Israel;" on the contrary, in xiv. 19 we read that it was the Malakh; compare how it is said in Num. xx. 16, Jehovah sent an angel to lead Israel out of Egypt. But in Ex. xiv. 24 ff. the leader is again called *Jehovah*, and in xxiii. 20 ff. God promises to bring the people into the promised land by His Malakh; the people were to obey the Malakh, for in him is Jehovah's *name*. In numerous other passages it is distinctly said, that Jehovah Himself is in the midst of His people.

9. But the section Ex. xxxii. f. is of especial importance. After the first breach of the covenant, Jehovah will Himself no longer go in the midst of the people (xxxiii. 3), He will send a Malakh before them (ver. 2), and He calls him (xxxiii. 34) also מַלְאָכִי [*Malakhi*, my angel]. Thereafter He yields to the entreaties of Moses to allow His countenance (פָּנִים) to go with them (xxxiii. 14 f.). This countenance must again have appeared in the form of an angel; for it is said in Isa. lxiii. 9, in reference to the leading through the wilderness, מַלְאַךְ פָּנָיו הוֹשִׁיעָם [the angel of his presence saved them]. Also *Deuteronomy*, which never has the Malakh (which makes a remarkable difference between this book and the preceding ones), but always represents Jehovah himself as acting, says (iv. 37) that God led Israel out of Egypt by his countenance. From this it is clear that there are two kinds of angel of Jehovah: one within whom is the name Jehovah, who is the bearer of His countenance, and another with whom this is not the case.

10. Josh. v. 14 f., the Prince of the army of Jehovah appears to Joshua. This is told as if he were different from Jehovah. But in ver. 15 he identifies Himself manifestly with the Malakh that appeared to Moses in Ex. iii., and in Josh. vi. 2 he again appears as Jehovah himself, who gives Jericho into Joshua's hand.

The following passages from the *later books* of the Old Testament come especially into consideration, as analogous to the passages in the Pentateuch :—

11. Judg. ii. 1–5, where it is probable that a prophet is not to be understood by מַלְאָךְ (as Bertheau, for example, maintains). The Malakh says : "I brought you up out of Egypt," etc. ; v. 23 : "Curse Meroz, saith the angel of Jehovah ;" vi. 11 ff., the Malakh that appeared to Gideon, who (ver. 14) quite passes over into Jehovah, and even accepts an offering, though Gideon (ver. 22) in addressing Jehovah seems in a remarkable manner to distinguish the Malakh from Him, and afterward when the Malakh has disappeared, still (ver. 23) receives Jehovah's word.

12. Similarly in Zechariah the angel of the Lord is distinguished on the one hand from Jehovah : he appears (i. 12) interceding for Israel before Jehovah. But, on the other hand, he takes the place of Jehovah himself in chap. iii., where, however, the angel speaks again of Jehovah in the third person.

(1) The *doctrine of the angel of the Lord* is one of the most important and difficult points in the Old Testament, on which, even as early as the Church Fathers, there were various views, and about which, to this day, no agreement has been reached. The literature is enormously rich. Ode's book, *Commentarius de Angelis*, 1739, still deserves to be mentioned on account of its copiousness. The following are the most important treatises within the last fifty years :—a Programme by Steudel, *Veterisne testamenti libris insit notio manifesti ab occulto distinguendi numinis*, Tüb. 1830 (one of his best writings) ; Hengstenberg, *Christology of the O. T.* Kurtz formerly defended Hengstenberg's view, "Der Engel des Herrn," in Tholuck's *Liter. Anzeiger*, 1846, Nos. 11–14, but treats the matter differently in his *History of the Old Covenant*. Compare further, Trip, *Die Theophanien in den Geschichtsbüchern des A. T.*, Leiden, 1858 ; in the same year a Programme by Kahnis, *De angelo Domini diatribe ;* Barth, *der Engel des Bundes, Sendschreiben an Schelling*, 1845 ; compare Schelling's answer in Schelling's *Leben in Briefen*, iii. p. 189 ff.—Schultz p. 564 ff. has discussed the doctrine of the angel of the Lord more thoroughly that in his first edition : [see also Ewald, Hitzig, and Kübel, art. "Engel" in Herzog, iv. p. 222].

(2) The grouping of the passages by numbers is to facilitate reference in the following section.

§ 60.

Continuation : The Different Views.

The question is now, Which view of the Mal'akh gives the most satisfactory explanation of these apparently contradictory passages? The following main views are to be distinguished :

1. The first view is that taken in the early ages of the church by Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great ; in our day, by Steudel and Trip, and with special modifications by Hofmann (in *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i.), from whom it has been adopted by Kurtz and Delitzsch, who gave up their former view under Hofmann's influence, though Delitzsch indeed holds the view with a peculiar indecision. On this view, an *angel* is to be understood by the Malakh, that is, a *finite spirit* under subjection to God, which executes the divine command in the cases mentioned. That a particular angel may be styled *the* angel of Jehovah,—that the term Malakh, in and for itself, does not necessarily imply that the person so characterized stands in a higher sphere above the angels,—must certainly be conceded. On

this view, the explanation of the fact, that in a series of passages what the angel speaks and does, appears as the words and acts of Jehovah, is, that the words and acts of a messenger are properly the words and acts of him whom he represents. It is also urged that in the prophetic style the word of the prophet is often identified with the word of Jehovah; and that in the New Testament, where the ἄγγελος κυρίου is certainly a created spirit, his act (*e.g.* Acts xii. 17) is represented as an act of the Lord himself; indeed, in Rev. xxii. 6, 12, the angel is introduced speaking for the Lord himself, and that in the first person. In reference to the prophetic style, however, it must be noted, that the prophets almost always introduce the divine word with "Thus saith Jehovah," "Jehovah's saying is," and the like, which is a rare exception with the Malakh, *e.g.* Gen. xxii. 16, and with regard to Rev. xxii. 6, 12, the angel there refuses the προσκύνησις offered in ver. 9, while the Old Testament Malakh accepts it (Josh. v. 14), and allows a sacrifice to be made to him (Judg. vi. 19 ff., xiii. 18 ff.).

But, again, this first view occurs in *two forms*. According to the *first* of these, the Malakh is an angel specially deputed by God from among the number of Malakhim for *each separate occasion*, and we have no means of deciding whether he is always the same angel or not (Steudel); according to the *second* form, (principally Hofmann), it is always *one and the same angel* through whom God stands in relation to the people of revelation from the beginning to the end of the Old Testament—"the *special angel* (as Hofmann expresses it in the *Schriftbeweis*, 2d ed. i. p. 177) who rules in the commonwealth and history of this people," the archangel Michael of the book of Daniel (compare also *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 131). Apart from the question whether the מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה really passes over into the Michael of Daniel, which is not to be treated of till we come to the prophetic theology, and then must be answered in the negative, the latter form of the view seems to be decidedly preferable to the former, from the *high titles* which are conferred on the angel. But in reference to the whole first view, it is unquestionably correct, if we assume that the mediation of angels is *entirely the same* throughout the whole history of revelation, both in the Old and the New Testament. Then the older passages must be explained by the later, especially by the New Testament passages; and in these latter the angel is manifestly hypostatically distinguished from God, and is a created finite being subordinate to God. This conception is also admissible in several of the older passages. The one that favors it most is No. 2, if Gen. xix. 18 ff. is understood to mean that even the two angels who are certainly subordinate, are treated exactly as if Jehovah appeared in them (see particularly ver. 24). Among the passages in the Pentateuch, Num. xxii. 31, in which the angel is definitely distinguished from Jehovah, is to be adduced here; but in a number of other passages no natural sense is given by this assumption, and the passages Nos. 6 and 9 are entirely at variance with it. In general it is to be observed that the assumption that the Malakh of the Pentateuch must be explained by the ἄγγελος κυρίου of the New Testament is not authorized, because it fails to recognize the gradual progress of revelation, which advances from theophanies to revelations made through divinely appointed organs and through the Spirit. To this is to be added, that exactly the same expressions are used in speaking of the representation of God by the Malakh as in speaking of the divine indwelling in the sanc-

tuary ; there is in both the divine name and the divine countenance (comp. the passages under Nos. 8 and 9). Now if the Shekhina, the indwelling in the sanctuary, is to be understood, according to the Old Testament, not simply as an ideal and symbolical, but a real presence of God, an entering of the divine into the sphere of the creature, the presence of God in the Malakh must not be taken differently.

2. Thus we come to the *second principal view :* that the Malakh of Jehovah is a *self-presentation of Jehovah entering into the sphere of the creature*, and is *one in essence with Jehovah ;* and is yet again different from Him (2). This view has been held in three different forms :

(*a*) According to the first of these, the Malakh is the *Logos*—the *second* person of the Godhead in the sense of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. This is the view of most of the Greek Fathers : of Justin, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. 56, 61, 127 f.; also of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Eusebius of Cæsarea gives us a full discussion of the Old Testament theophany, from this point of view, in his *Eclogæ Propheticæ* (published by Th. Gaisford, 1842). At a later period this was the view of the Lutheran theologians ; in our own day it has been defended by Hengstenberg (who speaks of the Malakh as an uncreated angel), and by others.

(*b*) According to the second form (so Barth), the angel of Jehovah is a created being ; with which, however, the *uncreated Logos was personally connected.*

(*c*) According to the third (so Vatke, De Wette, and others), the Malakh is nothing hypostatical [i. e. not a personal being], but only an *unsubstantial manifestation of God ;* a momentary descent of God into visibility ; a *mission* of God (here מַלְאָךְ is taken in its original abstract meaning), which again returns into the Divine Being.

Against the *first* view, it is to be observed that it brings into the Old Testament a *finished dogma* on the subject of an immanent distinction in the divine nature for which the passages which lie before us contain no sufficient authorization, since they do not tell us anything of an inward and essential relation in God's being, but only distinguish the divine which has entered into the sphere of created phenomena from the Divine Being in his celestial infinitude, as appears in a very remarkable manner in Gen. xix. 24, "Jehovah caused it to rain from Jehovah out of heaven." Even Hengstenberg admits that, in the Old Testament, the Revealer and He whom He reveals, lose themselves in each other, as it were ; so that from this view ideas might easily arise very similar to those of Sabellianism. Moreover, as is justly urged by the adherents of the second view (Barth), it is certainly a strange expression to speak of an uncreated *angel.* The phenomena of nature, which serve as a form of manifestation to the Malakh ; the flame (Ex. iii.), the cloudy covering (Ex. xl. 36–38), the human form (in well-known passages), are certainly created. It is not the Malakh that is uncreated, but the God who veils Himself in His appearance.

In opposition to the *second* view, it is to be remarked that there is no proof that the manifestation of the Divinity in the form of the Malakh was such that the Son of God became permanently an angel ; so that again in becoming man He had as it were to strip off the angelic form which He had received, and change it for a human nature (to which Barth's view amounts). Finally, the *third* view does justice to a number of passages ; but from others it clearly appears that not

merely a personification, but a real person, is present in the manifestation of the Malakh.

It must be acknowledged, then, that *no one of the various views does full justice to all the passages*; that the doctrine of the Malakh in the Old Testament oscillates in a peculiar manner between the conception of the angel, as a form and as a being, so that it seems impossible to bring the matter to a definite intelligible expression. But the case has a different aspect from the standpoint of the New Testament. From this (see especially 1 Cor. x. 4) it is *the Logos, the Son of God* through whom revelations to Israel are made, and who therefore works in the Malakh. But nowhere in the New Testament is the Son of God so identified with the Malakh as if His incarnation had been preceded by His *permanently* becoming an angel. The Logos, according to the New Testament view, works also in the other forms of revelation in the old covenant and in just the same way as in the form of the Malakh (3).

(1) Delitzsch also has not failed to recognize this element, when, in his Commentary on Genesis (1st ed. p. 256, 2d ed. p. 337), he insists, indeed, that the Malakh is to be understood as a finite spirit, but at the same time says that it must not be forgotten that in this personally living finite spirit, God presents Himself in person; that the angel has Jehovah, not outside of him, but within him; that the relation to the Malakh is less than a *becoming* an angel, yet more than a *sending* of an angel. His conception, which occupies an intermediate position between the first and second main views, lacks clearness.

(2) Among the defenders of this view Schultz is also to be reckoned. "The angel of God is the revelation of the divine essence and will, when it is made to man for a distinct purpose. . . . He represents God: he is the form of the revelation of God: what he speaks is the word of God: one who has seen him has seen God." (p. 567 f.) Whether the Angel is to be conceived of as in his own substance a personal being, he does not say. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, i. pp. 389 ff., 428 ff., has pointed out a remarkable analogy in which the Phœnician religion here stands to that of the Old Testament, namely, in the way in which the relation of Heracles to the ancient Bel is understood in the former faith,—difference in unity, and unity in difference, being firmly held.

(3) In the *later Jewish theology*, the doctrine of the *Metatron* (probably from [illegible], sharer of the throne),—the Prince of the countenance, who is the revealer of God, the mediator between God and the creature,—is developed out of the Old Testament doctrine of the angel of the Lord, the angel of the covenant, of the countenance. In order to make him as near as possible to God, he was understood by some to be not a creature, but an emanation from the Divine Being; and then, in order to do justice to other passages in the Old Testament, they again distinguished from him a second lower, created Metatron. But even the later Jewish theology did not penetrate to the recognition of an immanent and real distinction in the Divine Being.

§ 61.

Other Points of the Mosaic Angelology.

Even in the Pentateuch, though there comparatively seldom, other angels of God appear side by side with the *Malakh* v. *infra*. Nothing is said about their creation; the fact that they are not mentioned in the account of the creation is probably to be explained from the circumstance that this record aims merely to give a history of the creation of the earth, and its completion in man. On

the contrary, the book of Job, chap. xxxviii. 7, presupposes the existence of the angels when the earth was created. In those passages in the Pentateuch in which other angels besides the Malakh are mentioned, they appear without independent activity, as a sort of multiplication of the operating power of God: thus especially Gen. xxviii. 12, besides which compare xxxii. 2 f., in which passage they are called God's army; Deut. xxxiii. 2, where they appear as the attendants of God, manifested in His glory at the giving of the law. Gen. vi. 1 ff. would be entirely without a parallel, not only in the Pentateuch, but in the whole Old Testament, if higher spirits are to be understood by the בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים (1). It is true the angels, the מַלְאָכִים, besides this name, which is characteristic of their calling, bear in the Old Testament the name sons of God (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים), Job i. 6, ii. 1, or בְּנֵי אֵלִים, Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7, in order to express the closer fellowship in which they stand to God (2). Accordingly, Gen. vi. 1 ff. is referred to *the fall of the angels* by many recent theologians (Hofmann, Kurtz, Delitzsch), as had been already done by several of the Church Fathers,—a view which originally (as Keil has pointed out) sprang from the book of Enoch. According to another view, on the contrary (some of the Fathers of the Church, the Reformers, and in more modern times Dettinger, Hengstenberg, Keil, and others), the expression "sons of God" refers *to men*, to *the pious race descended from Seth*, as the name "sons of God" is used in Deut. xiv. 1, xxxii. 5, Hos. ii. 1, Ps. lxxiii. 15. On this view, the passage refers to the marriage of Seth's descendants with Cainitic women, by which means the corruption of Cain's race spread among the Sethites. Not only is the connection in which the whole story stands to what precedes, but also ver. 3, in which an erring of man, not of the higher spirits, is spoken of, in favor of the latter view; but so also is the expression "they took wives," which is confessedly used in the Old Testament only in speaking of formal marriage, not of unchaste connection. The assertion that הָאָדָם in contrast with the בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, must refer to the whole race of mankind, and cannot be taken in a relative sense, is refuted by comparing it with similar passages, such as Jer. xxxii. 20 (בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּבָאָדָם), Isa. xliii. 4, Ps. lxxiii. 5. The assertion, repeated by Schrader, that there is no ground to assume that two moral tendencies radically different ran through mankind in primeval times, can only be wondered at in view of Gen. iv. Note especially that Seth's race, iv. 26, is characterized as that race by which God is adored as Jehovah, and therefore as the race of revelation (3).

In comparison with the later books of the Old Testament, *the angelology of the Pentateuch is but little developed.* This testifies against the opinion of those who hold the angels of the Old Testament to be degraded gods of an ancient polytheism. De Wette, in his *Biblical Dogmatics* (3d ed. p. 81), has well remarked, in opposition to this view, that if this had been the case, the course of the angelology in the Old Testament must have been exactly the opposite of what it is. The angels would necessarily have appeared with definite names and functions in the older books, not first in the latest ones. But De Wette himself holds a view equally false,—namely, that angels were originally personifications of natural forces, or of the extraordinary operations and visitations of God. Even Ps. civ. 4 is no proof of the former point (4); on the contrary, such a personification of natural forces presupposes a belief in angels.—In the Pentateuch, the Malakh-

im are obviously connected with the Malakh, forming as it were *many fainter copies of him*, and in this connection the vision in Gen. xxviii. is especially instructive. The idea of the Malakh, however, is not the product of a tendency to personification; but its meaning is, as we have already seen, that in him a beginning is made toward the doing away of the separation between God and the world (5).

(1) Gen. vi. 1 ff.: "And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that pleased them. Then Jehovah said: My spirit shall not always rule in men, in their errors they are flesh; and let their days be a hundred and twenty years. There were giants on the earth in those days; and also afterward, when the sons of God went in to the daughters of men, and they bare unto them, there were strong ones who were of old renowned men."—We need not waste words on the ancient view (Onkelos, etc.) that בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים here denotes sons of princes, magnates, and that the whole matter refers to mesalliances, that noble blood was mixed with plebeian blood, and this drew down the divine wrath on man. The question is: Are the sons of God Sethites, or are they higher spirits? and is a fall of the angels here spoken of? On the latter supposition, we should have an element in Genesis of which there is certainly no trace in the Old Testament, and which rather puts us in mind of the heathen myths. But this must not hinder us from candidly acknowledging anything that the text demands. The passage has led to a very bitter feud between Kurtz and Hengstenberg. Kurtz wrote two separate polemical treatises upon it (1857–58). At present the hypothesis of the angels is the most widely spread. But I believe that especially Dettinger ("Bemerkungen über den Abschnitt 1 Mos. iv. 1–vi. 8, den Zusammenhang und einzelne schwierigere Partien desselben," *Tüb. Zeitschr. für Theol.* 1835, vol. i.), and Keil ("Die Ehen der Kinder Gottes mit den Töchtern der Menschen," *Zeitschr. für luth. Theol. und Kirche*, 1855, p. 220 f.), who also still defends the older view, are quite in the right here.—Compare also, for the angel hypothesis, Schrader, *Studien zur Kritik und Erklärung der biblischen Urgeschichte Gen.* i.–xi., 1863. [See also Schultz p. 118 ff. Köhler, *Bibl. Gesch. d. A. T.* I. p. 56.]

(2) Some understand אֱלִים to be a *pluralis majestatis* for אֱלֹהִים, which would be admissible if only אֱלִים occurred in this sense in any one passage. But elsewhere אֱלִים is always a pure plural. Therefore I hold that view to be correct which regards בְּנֵי אֱלִים grammatically as a double plural of בֶּן־אֵל, like גִּבּוֹרֵי הַיָּלִים, 1 Chron. vii. 5, for גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִל.

(3) [The support of the explanation which makes the sons of God to be the Sethites would certainly be gone if, as Schultz supposes, we could not know that the Sethites were good and the Cainites ungodly, and if (p. 119) the narrative in Gen. vi. 1 ff. makes no mention of Cain or of Seth and their descendants and stands where it does only because between Gen. ii. 4 *b* and the end of chap iv. there was no place for it. But this last assertion is nothing but a hypothesis, to which the confidence with which it is advanced gives no scientific value. Even supposing that the passage did not originally belong to the composition of which it now forms a part, what support does this give to the assumption that it formerly stood in no connection, or in one different from the present one? Against the remark concerning the Sethites and Cainites compare Schultz's own words p. 628: "and indeed in the time of Seth the propagation of a *better* tendency of mankind appears, while in the posterity of Cain, sin . . . defiantly flaunts the power of self-defence and the appeal to force." That the Sethites, on account of their religious relation to God might be called "sons of God," and in contrast with them the others simply "men," ought not to be denied.] The inconvenient בְּשַׁגַּם Schrader gets out of the way by a change of the text. Comp. on this word § 77, note 4.

(4) Ps. civ. 4 is explained in different ways, according to what is regarded as the nearer object. I hold the common explanation to be the right one: "He makes the winds His messengers, and flames of fire His servants." The other view is: "He makes His messengers winds," etc. (Hofmann).

(5) Compare also Schultz's *Old Testament Theol.* (p. 568).—For the further development of Old Testament angelology, see the *Prophetic Theology* (§ 197 ff).—On Azazel, see § 140.

§ 62.

The Shekhina.

The continuous localization of the divine presence was made in the *Shekhina*, that is, the dwelling of God, distinguished from passing theophanies by virtue of its continuance. The expression belongs properly to the later Jewish theology, but is drawn from those passages in the Old Testament where a *dwelling* (שְׁכֵן) of Jehovah or of the name of Jehovah among the people is spoken of, Deut. xii. 5, 11, xiv. 23, 1 Kings viii. 12, because of which the holy tabernacle is called his *dwelling* (מִשְׁכַּן יְהוָה), more fully expressed in 1 Kings viii. 13, as בֵּית זְבוּל לְךָ מָכוֹן לְשִׁבְתְּךָ.

The first abode of the divine Shekhina, according to the Old Testament, was Eden, as appears from the whole description in Gen. ii. f., but in particular from the mention of the cherubim, iii. 24, which were bearers of the divine presence. There it remained after the fall; there was the divine countenance, according to which iv. 14 is to be interpreted. The book of Genesis seems to suggest the idea that the dwelling-place of the glory and the countenance of God continued there upon the earth until the judgment of the flood came on the world. Then after the flood God revealed Himself for the first time from heaven. At a later time, God's dwelling among His people was in the sanctuary, of which, Ex. xl. 34–38, the glory of Jehovah (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה) took possession in the phenomenon of the cloud, in the same way in which, Lev. xvi. 2, it appears in the same phenomenon over the ark of the covenant. Here now is God's *countenance*, according to which the well-known expressions are to be explained: Ex. xxiii. 17, יֵרָאֶה אֶל-פְּנֵי יהוה, shall appear before the face of Jehovah; Deut. xxxi. 11, לֵרָאוֹת אֶת-פְּנֵי יהוה; compare further Ps. xlii. 3, lxiii. 3, in which the consciousness of the especial presence of God in the sanctuary is actually characterized as a gazing on God. From passages such as Lev. ix. 24, x. 2, the Shekhina shows its reality in the sanctuary by means of acts of power which go out from it. Because of it, the Israelite was in all places to turn himself toward the sanctuary when praying, 1 Kings viii. 30, 35, 38 (in Solomon's prayer)—the so-called Kebla, compare Dan. vi. 11. Hence the explanation of passages like Ps. iii. 5: "I cried to Jehovah with my voice, and He answered me from His holy hill." The Shekhina of God on earth corresponds to His dwelling in *heaven*, 1 Kings viii. 30, 39, 49, which, like that in the sanctuary, is definitely distinguished from the presence of God, which embraces the whole universe; see ver. 27 of the same chapter; compare Deut. iv. 39, Isa. lxvi. 1. In this sense the heavenly dwelling-place is explained as the sphere from which answers to prayer proceed, 1 Kings viii. 30, 32, 34, 39, 43. In view of such utterances, it is not in the sense of the Old Testament, to explain passages in which heaven is designated as the temple of God, Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 7, xxix. 9,

or in which God's throne in heaven is spoken of, Ps. ii. 4, ciii. 19, etc., as a purely popular, unconsciously symbolical manner of expression. (Comp. § 46.)

According to the foregoing, God's dwelling is outside the human subject; the idea of the divine habitation is not applied to the sending of the Divine Spirit into the heart of man (1). Even the passage Isa. lvii. 15 does not speak of God dwelling in the heart of the humble ones. The New Testament (John i. 14) is the first to place the divine Shekhina in a human person, in the Logos become flesh (*ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*), and then it speaks of God's making His abode (*μονὴν ποιεῖν*) with believers (John xiv. 23). Still the proper Shekhina of God in heaven appears again in the Apocalypse (Rev. vii. 15), and the aim of the divine kingdom is said to be the *σκήνωσις* of God on the glorified earth (xxi. 3); compare also Jer. iii. 16 f. (2).

(1) Compare the doctrine of the רוּחַ, § 65. Here is a remarkable difference between the theology of the *Koran* and the Old Testament: the Koran, borrowing from the New Testament, speaks of the divine Shekhina as sent down into the hearts of believers, Sur. xlviii. 4 and 26 ("Who sends down His Shekhina into the hearts of believers, that they grow continually in the faith"). But the Koran so wholly lacks the New Testament knowledge of the indwelling of God in believers' hearts through the Spirit, that this idea is reduced to an empty phrase. Compare Dettinger, "Beiträge zu einer Theol. des Korans," *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1834, pp. 16–21.

(2) Rev. vii. 15: "They serve Him day and night in His temple, *καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς.*"—According to Jer. iii. 16 f., the Shekhina of Jehovah is to be no longer connected with the ark of the covenant in the time of salvation. That indwelling of God, whose vehicle was the ark of the covenant, and whose abode was the holy of holies, shall be extended over the whole of Jerusalem, so that the ark of the covenant shall not be missed. The barrier which separated the sinful people from their God is taken away. Jerusalem is now co-ordinate with the name of Jehovah; he who comes to Jerusalem comes to the name of Jehovah.—Touching the import of the Old Testament doctrine of the Shekhina, compare also the passage from Luther's *Exeget. opera lat.* xvi. p. 71, already quoted, § 6, note 3.

§ 63.

The Doctrine of Miracle. Its Appearance in History and Various Names.

The forms of revelation discussed in the preceding paragraphs may be brought under the notion of the *miraculous*, so far as they are manifestations which interrupt the ordinary course of nature, and cannot be explained thereby. But in the stricter sense, the Old Testament understands by miracles, נִפְלָאוֹת, not manifestations of the Divine Being in the sense of immediate personal communication, but manifestations of the divine *power* in the objective world, both in nature and in history. It is characteristic of the course of Old Testament revelation, that no real miracle—that is, no miracle wrought by man's agency—is related in the *time of the patriarchs*. Not until the deliverance from Egypt did God reveal Himself as עֹשֵׂה פֶלֶא (Ex. xv. 11), or, in other words, not till then begin the divine נִפְלָאוֹת (iii. 20). *Moses* is the first organ of revelation endowed with the gift of performing miracles. From that time onward, miracles are grouped only around a few organs of revelation; and, indeed, they occur chiefly when the point

in question is to give testimony for the reality of the God revealed in Israel, in opposition to heathenism, that is, where the living God measures Himself in combat with false gods; so from Ex. viii. 18, xxxiv. 10, onward in many passages (in Egypt, in the kingdom of the ten tribes, in Babel, etc.).—The closer definition of the notion of miracles follows mainly from the *names for a miracle*:—

1. The most general expression, פֶּלֶא, נִפְלָאוֹת, from פלא = פלה, to select, characterizes miracle in its *negative* aspect, as an occurrence withdrawn from the common course of things, and thus an *extraordinary occurrence*. This, too, seems to be the notion expressed by the original meaning of the word מוֹפֵת; but the explanation of this difficult word is uncertain. According to the derivation given by Delitzsch (on Ps. lxxi. 7), it would come from the Arabic root *aphata*, which signifies "to twist, to turn"; it would then mean something tortuous, strangely turned, and in this sense something to excite astonishment. Others refer to the stem יפה, to gleam, or, like Fürst, to the stem יפע, which has the same meaning (so that the word would stand for מוֹפֵעַת), from which it would signify glittering, gleaming. In the New Testament this negative characteristic of a miracle is denoted by the expression *τέρας*.

2. On the contrary, the *positive* side of a miracle is expressed in the term גְּבוּרוֹת (mighty deeds), corresponding to the New Testament *δυνάμεις*, that is, indications of divine *power*, side by side with which (comp. e.g. Deut. iii. 24) there appears the more general emphatic expression מַעֲשִׂים, or more frequently עֲלִילוֹת, great deeds, corresponding to *ἔργα* in John. According to this, a miracle would mainly be a *divine act of power, exempt from the common course of nature and history*. So far as it is something *new* which cannot be understood from the past, it is placed under the view-point of *creation*, Ex. xxxiv. 10: "I will do נִפְלָאוֹת, such as have never been created (נִבְרָאוּ) on the whole earth." Indeed, a miracle is itself called בְּרִיאָה, a thing created, Num. xvi. 30, compared with Jer. xxxi. 22.

3. But the full idea of a miracle is expressed only by its *teleological* designation as אוֹת, *σημεῖον*, according to which its meaning is, an *indication of something higher and divine, and so to serve a definite divine aim*. Here too would belong the word מוֹפֵת, if in its original signification, adopted by some scholars, it is to be referred to a root יפת, from the biliteral פת, signifying to open. It would thus indicate that by which anything is opened and unlocked. And this idea is certainly brought out by מוֹפֵת in its *narrower* meaning, in which it denotes *portentum*, a sign pointing to the future, or sometimes a type; compare Isa. viii. 18, xx. 2. Perhaps the word is so to be understood in Deut. xiii. 2, where it is distinguished from אוֹת (אוֹת אוֹ מוֹפֵת).

§ 64.

Continuation. More exact Definition of Miracles.

What has been already stated gives no more than a relative definition of miracle. *Every* more notable manifestation of the course of nature and history presents a side on which it is extraordinary and excites astonishment, brings the divine power to view, and may be recognized as serving a divine aim. And, in

fact, the Old Testament sometimes makes use of the expression נִפְלָאוֹת in a wider sense; when, for example, marine phenomena are called God's wonders in the deep, Ps. cvii. 24; when in Ps. cxxxix. 14 it is said with reference to man: "I praise Thee, because I am an astonishing wonder; Thy works are marvellous, and my soul knoweth it right well." What Hegel says in the *Philosophy of Religion* (ii. 1st ed. p. 49) is not correct,—namely, that the things in the Old Testament religion are prosaic things, presented in various intellectual connections of cause, result, quality, and quantity, according to all these categories of the understanding. This, says Hegel, is what we call a natural, rational connection; and only here can the definite notion of "miracle" occur as something in opposition to the natural connection of things (1). On the contrary, what has been already said shows that the way of looking at nature characteristic of the Old Testament does not at all consist in the contemplation of such a *natural* causal nexus. God's power rules in everything,—God, who causes the breath of life to go forth and withdraws it again (Ps. civ. 29 f.); who unrolls the heaven, and renews the earth, etc. (2). Thus, according to the Old Testament view, God does not by miracle, in the narrower sense of the word, do anything that *surpasses* in quality His universal control in nature and history. The *more exact definition of miracles in the more limited sense* is given by the more exact definition of the *aim* of miracles, namely, that miracles serve to reveal God in His kingdom. *Miracles*, in the stricter sense, are *extraordinary manifestations and occurrences, in which God makes known His power for the purposes of His kingdom in a unique manner.* From this it is explicable why miracles appear as manifestations of the divine *holiness;* the נֶאְדָּר בַּקֹּדֶשׁ, the One glorious in holiness, is the doer of miracles, Ex. xv. 11, compare Ps. lxxvii. 14 f. (3). Miracles serve this aim by means of the impression which they make (Ex. viii. 15: "This is the finger of God"), but only in connection with the *word-witness* which accompanies them or stands in connection with them. Even in such a case as 1 Sam. vii. 10, in which the corresponding word of God does not follow expressly, the sign is still made distinct by Samuel's preceding prayer. But particularly those miracles which serve as the credentials of an organ of revelation are themselves accredited by the word of God given in advance. Even a false prophet may through circumstances perform signs and wonders, but he is to be measured and judged by his false doctrine, Deut. xiii. 2 ff.—In this union with the word of God, and this priority of the latter, a preservative is furnished against the vain quest after wonders and signs, and a noteworthy difference between the Old Testament אוֹתוֹת and the *τέρατα, σήματα, ostenta, portenta* of heathenism, which, as a rule, do not become intelligible by means of a testimony in words added to them, but require explanation, and thus become a matter of human conjecture (4). Israel is directed to the word of revelation (Deut. xviii. 9 ff.), in opposition to all heathen divination, which has searched through heaven and earth to find signs of the divine counsel, but in its helplessness perishes. The exorcism of the dead, and other forms of divination, are an abomination, Lev. xix. 26, 31, xx. 27; and astrology is a folly, Isa. xlvii. 13, Jer. x. 2 f., etc.

(1) Hegel, *l.c.*, continues: "In earlier religions there are no miracles. In the Indian religion everything is out of connection from the start. Miracles first ap-

pear in opposition to the order of nature, the laws of nature, the conformity of nature to law, . . . and this variation is represented as a manifestation of God to a single person."

(2) Compare the doctrine of preservation, § 52.

(3) Ps. lxxvii. 14 f.: "God, Thy way is in holiness . . . Thou art the God that doest wonders." Compare the definition of holiness, § 44.

(4) Compare Nägelsbach's *Homerische Theologie*, 2d ed. p. 168 ff., on the Homeric idea of miracles.

§ 65.

On the Spirit of God.

God reveals Himself in the heart of man by His *Spirit*, רוּחַ, which, as the spirit of revelation, corresponds to the cosmical רוּחַ, in the same way as the word of revelation corresponds to the word of creation. As the *principle of cosmical life*, as רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים, as the mighty divine force of all things, the Spirit is the principle of the life of man's soul, and every natural intellectual gift in man is traced back to it: Joseph's wisdom, Gen. xli. 38; Bezaleel's skill in art, Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31 (1). Gen. vi. 3 shows that this Spirit of God has also an ethical signification, for, according to this passage, the government of God's Spirit is hampered by the errors of mankind. But a clouding and derangement of the mental life, such as was sent on Saul, is also an effect of the רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים, 1 Sam. xvi. 14–16, 23, xviii. 10. And here this evil רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים is definitely distinguished from רוּחַ יְהוָה, for the latter forsook Saul; but it was (xvi. 14) רוּחַ מֵאֵת יְהוָה, from Jehovah. But the Spirit as רוּחַ יְהוָה, or, to express it more definitely, רוּחַ קָדְשׁ יְהוָה, only acts within the *sphere of revelation*. It rules within the theocracy (Isa. lxiii. 11; Hag. ii. 5; Neh. ix. 20), but not as if all citizens of the Old Testament theocracy as such participated in this Spirit, which Moses expresses as a wish (Num. xi. 29) (2), but which is reserved for the future community of salvation (John iii. 1). In the Old Testament, the Spirit's work in the divine kingdom is rather that of *endowing the organs of the theocracy with the gifts required for their calling*, and those gifts of office in the Old Testament are similar to the gifts of grace in the New Testament, 1 Cor. xii. ff. In the *Pentateuch* its working appears exclusively in this connection. The Spirit bestows on Moses and the seventy elders skill to guide the people (Num. xi. 17 ff.), also to Joshua (Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9), and works at a later period in the judges, arousing and strengthening them (Judg. vi. 34, xi. 29, xiii. 25), and comes on the kings, who were called of God, at their anointing (1 Sam. x. 6, xvi. 13). As the Spirit of revelation, He produces in particular the gift of prophecy, Num. xi. 25 ff.; and even as רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים imparts the ability to prophesy to the heathen Balaam (Num. xxiv. 2), by which means he is made an organ of the revealing God against his will (xxii. 38). On the contrary, the Spirit does not appear in the Pentateuch as *the principle of sanctification in the pious;* this is first spoken of in the Psalms, Ps. li. 13, comp. vers. 12 and 14, cxliii. 10 (3).

Now this Spirit is represented as a *power proceeding from Jehovah,—a something communicated by Him*, which clings to the person to whom it is communicated, so that it may be apportioned from him to others (Num. xi. 17, 25; comp. also 2

Kings ii. 9), but it can also be taken away from him (as from Saul, 1 Sam. xvi. 14). It does not follow from 1 Kings xxii. 21 that the Spirit is regarded as a person, even if more than a personification is meant there (4); but the passage Isa. lxiii. 10, "But they strove against His Holy Spirit, and grieved Him" (an expression which reminds us of the word in reference to the Malakh, Ex. xxiii. 21, "Do not provoke Him"), does imply that in the Spirit Jehovah acts as a person (5).

The *relation of the Spirit of revelation to the human subject* is characterized in a way that makes it clear why a full *indwelling* of the Spirit in man, a penetration of the human spirit by the Holy Spirit, is not reached in the Old Testament, but only a working on the human mind. The Spirit is put on man, נָתַן with עַל, Num. xi. 25, 29; שׂוּם with עַל, ver. 17; He rests on him, נוּחַ, ver. 26; He clothes Himself with a man, לָבַשׁ, Judg. vi. 34 (compare 1 Chron. xii. 18, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20) (6); He breaks in upon him, צָלַח with עַל, Judg. xiv. 6, 19, and in other passages. His operations are characterized as an impulse or stroke, פַּעַם, xiii. 25, and therefore He often operates violently and overpoweringly on the human constitution (7).

(1) See the particulars in the *Anthropology*, § 70.

(2) Num. xi. 29: "Would that all the people were the prophets of the Lord, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!"

(3) Ps. li. 13, "Take not Thy Holy Spirit from me;" cxliii. 10, "Let Thy good Spirit lead me."

(4) The passage 1 Kings xxii. 21, on the Spirit of God, which acted as a lying spirit in the prophets, is discussed under the doctrine of Satan in the prophetic part of this book.

(5) Though we must not read the New Testament doctrine of the Trinity into the Old Testament, it is yet undeniable that we find the way to the œconomic Trinity of the New Testament already prepared in the doctrine of the Malakh and of the Spirit.

(6) The expositors differ in the explanation of the expression לָבַשׁ. Bertheau, Keil, Fuerst, Ewald explain Judg. vi. 34: The Spirit laid itself round Gideon like a coat of mail. But on this view, ought not Hiphil to be used? and is it not more correct to render *induit eum . . . Gideoni se includens?* The man is looked on as the covering of the Spirit, which rules, speaks, and testifies in him.

(7) The further account of the operations of the Spirit on the prophets (in treating of the theology of the prophets) must connect itself with these simple ideas, deduced from the principal passage, Num. xi. 25 ff.

§ 66.

The Psychical States of the Organs of Revelation.

As *psychical states* in which the reception of revelation by man takes place, the principal passage (Num. xii. 6–8) names, 1, *the dream;* 2, *the vision;* 3, the *immediate sight of the Divinity* as given to Moses, which stands higher than the other two (1).

1. *Dreams* appear in the Old Testament, as in antiquity generally, as the vehicle of divine revelation, but only in a subordinate way (2). It may be concluded from 1 Sam. xxviii. 6—in which a scale of the forms of revelation is given—that it stands

lowest among the forms of revelation ; this becomes still more clear from Deut. xiii. 2-5, according to which no one can accredit himself as an organ of revelation by means of dreams alone, but especially from Jer. xxiii. 28 f., where the "chaff" refers to dreams, and the consciously received word of God is designated "wheat" (3). So, too, Eccles. v. 3, 7 says, "Dreams come through much care." "Where there are many dreams and vanity, there are also many words ; but thou shalt fear thy God." While the prophets never appeal to dreams in their extant prophecies, dreams serve mainly as a vehicle of revelation to those who, though they are not properly speaking organs of revelation, obtain a divine communication in extraordinary circumstances. In the *Pentateuch*, dreams and the power of interpreting dreams given by God occur only in Gen. xx. 3, 6, xxviii. 12, xxxvii. 6 f., chap. xli. (Joseph) ; besides these, compare in the Old Testament, Judg. vii. 13 ff., 1 Kings iii. 5, and the dreams in the book of *Daniel*, because at the Babylonian as at the Egyptian court the revelation of the true God had to prove its superiority over the heathen Manticism. How God awakens the sleeping conscience of man by dreams is shown by Elihu in the book of Job xxxiii. 15 ff.

2. *Visions*, which are called מַרְאָה in the above-cited passage in Numbers, elsewhere in general מַחֲזֶה, Gen. xv. 1, חִזָּיוֹן, presuppose a previous elevation of the life of the soul into an extraordinary state, as is made prominent in the first narrative in which a vision appears, in Gen. xv. (with Abraham) (especially in the תַּרְדֵּמָה, ver. 12, sleep's deepest stupor, in which the inner vision arises.) Still the difference between a dream and a vision may be regarded as not sharply marked. Visions do not become a common form of revelation until the appearance of prophecy, and therefore this point is to be treated more fully in the prophetic theology.—By the two forms, dreams and visions, God speaks as is said in Num. xii. 8, only בְּחִידֹת, in riddles, that is, in a way which requires an explanation of the pictures presented to view.

3. The *immediate view of the Divinity* (פֶּה אֶל־פֶּה) with which Moses was favored stands higher than these forms ; that figureless, perfect, clear communication of knowledge, which is to be distinguished also from the vision of God in emblematical tokens, spoken in Ex. xxiv. 10 of Aaron and the elders of Israel. For the rest, the principle that a clear consciousness when receiving revelation is placed higher than ecstasy is of great importance for the right view of the Old Testament religion ; comp. the psychological discussion of prophecy, as well as use of the passage Num. xii. 6–8 in 1 Cor. xiii. 12 (4). The idea that in the case of some persons a view into the future opens at the moment of death is expressed in the Old Testament in Gen. xlix. and Deut. xxxiii. (in the blessings of Jacob and Moses). This idea is also found in heathen antiquity (5).

(1) Num. xii. 6–8 : "Hear ye my words : If there is among you a prophet of Jehovah, I will manifest myself to him in vision (בַּמַּרְאָה), and I will speak with him in dreams. Not so my servant Moses. He is faithful in my whole house. I speak with him mouth to mouth and through the medium of vision (וּמַרְאֶה), and not in riddles, and he sees the form of Jehovah ; and how is it that ye are not afraid to speak against my servant Moses?" Comp. the art. "Weissagung" in Herzog.

(2) This was also the Homeric view ; see Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* 2d ed. p. 182 ff., also Odyss. xix. 560 ff.

(3) 1 Sam. xxviii. 6 : "Jehovah answered Saul neither by dreams, nor by the Urim, nor by prophets."—Jer. xxiii. 28 f. : "Let the prophet who has dreams tell dreams, but he who has my word must speak my word in truth ; what is the straw to the wheat? saith the Lord."

(4) In 1 Cor. xiii. 12, that vision of the Divinity which Moses had is designated by Paul as the form of knowledge with which we are not yet favored, but shall be in the future.

(5) Comp. Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* 2d ed. p. 185 f.

SECOND DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN.

§ 67.

General View.

First of all, *the nature of man* is to be described without reference to the contradictory elements which through sin entered into its development; and then these contradictory elements are to be set forth as they appear in the difference between the *original perfection* of man on the one side, and the state of *sin and death* in which he now is on the other side. The anthropology of Mosaism is here to be carried to the point in which it passes over into the delineation of the *theocratic* relation of man to God (1).

(1) For the rich literature on Biblical anthropology, compare the most complete work on this topic: Delitzsch, *System of Biblical Psychology*, 1855, 2d ed. 1861. Besides this, the little book, *Fundamenta Psychologiæ ex sacra scriptura collecta*, 1769, by Roos, which is rich in fine remarks, and not yet obsolete; and the *Umriss der bibl. Seelenlehre*, by Beck, 1843, 3d ed. 1871, deserve special mention. Umbreit's book, *Die Lehre von der Sünde, ein Beitrag zur Theol. des A. T.*, 1853, goes over a good part of anthropology. Separate monographs will be mentioned in their proper places.

FIRST CHAPTER.

THE NATURE OF MAN IN ITS MAIN UNCHANGEABLE FEATURES.

1. THE IDEA OF MAN.

§ 68.

The *idea of man* is expressed in the statement that he is created in the *image of God* (Gen. i. 26 f.). This divine image is propagated (v. 1, compared with ver. 3). The dignity of the divine image is a second time ascribed to man (ix. 6), from which it is clear that *the divine image lies inalienably in man's being.*—The divine image is *not twofold* in the sense that in the words, i. 26, נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ (LXX. *ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν*), a distinction is to be made between צֶלֶם (*εἰκών*) and דְּמוּת (*ὁμοίωσις*); as, for example, Justin Martyr and Irenæus referred the first to the bodily form and the second to the spirit; or the Alexandrian Fathers proposed to understand *κατ' εἰκόνα* of the rational basis

of man's nature, and the *καθ' ὁμοίωσιν* of its free development to *τελείωσις*. The כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ in the passage quoted refers rather to the same thing as the בְּצַלְמֵנוּ; it only serves to fix and strengthen the meaning of the latter; it is designed to express the thought that the divine image which man bears is really one corresponding to the original pattern (1). In the omission of כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ in the passage ix. 6, we might be led to find an indication that the divine image in sinful man was no longer adequate to its original type. Still, ix. 6 simply refers to i. 27, in which the דְּמוּת is not repeated.

But now *what is to be understood* by the divine image? We are certainly not to think of the human *body* as if it was a copy of the divine form, for Elohim, the creative God, is without form (comp. § 46). We might rather say, that the human figure was to be so formed that it might serve to represent God Himself when He revealed Himself; compare also Ezek. i. 26, and especially Ps. xciv. 8–10 might be here adduced; while, on the contrary, the forms of animals never appear in the Old Testament as a vehicle of God's self-manifestation, but were representative of Jehovah only in idolatrous worship (2). The nobility which appears in the bodily figure of man is certainly not to be excluded from the idea of the divine image, but it is undoubtedly an error to limit the latter to what is bodily. It is equally erroneous to limit the divine likeness to the *dominion over the animal world*, as the Socinians did. This, no doubt, is also contained in the idea, but only as a consequence, and therefore as a secondary element; compare Gen. i. 26, and the passage ix. 6, which refers back to the latter. The divine likeness is rather to be referred to the *whole dignity of man* (כָּבוֹד וְהָדָר, comp. Ps. viii. 6), in virtue of which human nature is sharply distinguished from that of the beasts; *man as a free being is set over nature, and designed to hold communion with God, and to be his representative on earth.* The first or *negative* element, the wide distinction between man and beast, is expressed, first, in the fact that although animals are animate like man, and possess a נֶפֶשׁ [soul], yet the creation of man as a living being, according to Gen. i. 26, ii. 7, is a unique and peculiar divine act; and further, in the circumstance that man finds no corresponding companionship among all the animals (ii. 20); lastly, in the permission to man to kill every animal, but not another man (ix. 2 ff.), and this because of the divine likeness (comp. § 108). The prohibitions in Ex. xxii. 18, Lev. xviii. 23, xx. 15, rest on this recognition of the dignity of human nature, by which all connection of man with beast—an abomination for which the heathen have no moral abhorrence—was to be punished by the death of the criminal. Thus the *standpoint of the religion of nature is absolutely denied in the Old Testament*, alike in the idea of God as the Holy One, and in the idea of man as God's image.—The second or *positive* element is indicated partly in the main passage Gen. i. 26, and partly in the whole history, chap. ii. and iii.: A being is to stand at the head of the creatures, invested with dominion over them (comp. Ps. viii. 7–9), with whom God holds intercourse as with His equal, and who is appointed, like God, to be a free agent (though we see from Gen. iii. 22, comp. ver. 5, that man arrives at this by a wrong way). To the ethical idea of God corresponds the ethical idea of man. The spiritual dominion of man over the beasts is indicated in the giving of names, Gen. ii. 19 f. In regard to this dignity of man, Ps. viii. 6 says that man was made little lower than Elohim, than

a numen, a divine being (3). The book of Sirach xvii. 3–6 (enumerating dominion over the animals, free will, speech, sense, etc.) gives an explanation of the divine image which is on the whole correct, only that the essential feature, that man was appointed to communion with God in virtue of his likeness to Him, is not brought forward (4).

(1) My view is that this is the correct conception of Gen. i. 26. Umbreit has understood the passage quite differently in the book cited above, p. 4: "The כְּ seems rather to lessen than strengthen the meaning of בְּ; man is to appear in the image of God—not, however, in complete similarity to God's image, but only after His likeness."—But the emphatic repetition of בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים in ver. 27 does not agree with this; on this view, the כִּדְמוּת would rather require to be repeated in explanation.

(2) On the view that divine attributes are symbolized in the cherubim, see on the ordinances of worship, § 119.

(3) The LXX translate the מֵאֱלֹהִים in Ps. viii. 6 by *παρ' ἀγγέλους*, and it is certain that this translation is not exact. But it is generally overlooked that the text does not say "like thee," or at least "like Jehovah," as Schultz (*Alttest. Theol.* p. 594) has well remarked. The idea, Thou hast made him little lower than Jehovah, would not have been possible in the Old Testament. אֱלֹהִים here stands in the indefinite and general term, *numen*, divine being, and thus far the translation of the LXX is not exactly incorrect.

(4) Upon the import of the Old Testament idea of man, see Lutz, *Bibl. Dogmatik*, p. 17. He characterizes it as a fact of the very greatest importance that the difference petween spirit and nature is here so fully brought out, and that the value of spiritual existence is not placed merely in the power of thought, but in moral purity. [Comp. also, on the whole Section, Orelli, *Die alttestamentl. Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreichs.* Wien 1882, p. 93 ff.].

II. MAN IN RELATION TO SEX AND RACE.

§ 69.

1. *The sexual relation of man and woman is originally ordained* in Gen. i. 27 (זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם). The frequent assertion that, according to Genesis, man was originally created androgynous, cannot be reconciled with the passage quoted, and has only arisen from a false view of the relation of chap. i. to chap ii. Besides, even chap. ii. teaches nothing about a man who was at once man and woman, and from whom man and woman as such derived their being. But man was created first, and the woman by being taken from him; as also the passage is understood in 1 Tim. ii. 13, 1 Cor. xi. 8 f. It agrees with this that the perfection of mankind is also realized in a man, the *δεύτερος Ἀδάμ*, and that the *ἀναστάσεως υἱοί* are not spouses, neither marry nor are given in marriage, but shall be *ἰσάγγελοι*, Matt. xxii. 30, Luke xx. 36. But that man's existence in two sexes as compared with his original singleness is already (as has been maintained even in modern times) the beginning of the fall, is contrary to the natural sense of Gen. ii. 18 ff.

2. According to this passage, *marriage*, that primitive form of human society from which all other forms of society arise, and for which man gives up the others (comp. ii. 24), did not spring from the blind sway of natural impulse, but from

divine institution. Its original form is monogamy (comp. Matt. xix. 6) ; and the fact that the bond of matrimony is represented as stronger than that moral relation between parents and children, which is placed so high in the Old Testament, indicates that it forms not simply a bodily union (בָּשָׂר אֶחָד), but also a *spiritual* oneness. Monogamy appears still among the first patriarchs (Abraham, Nahor, Isaac), besides which, to be sure, the taking of concubines is allowable (Gen. xxii. 24, xxv. 6), and even in certain circumstances occurs at the wish of the legitimate spouse herself (xvi. 3, xxx. 3, 9). As indicative of character, polygamy (Gen. iv. 19) is traced to the Cainites. The *law*—we here simply observe (comp. § 102,) —does indeed tolerate polygamy, but does not sanction it, and, moreover, provides against the wrongs that easily spring from it ; comp. Ex. xxi. 10, Deut. xxi. 15 ff. Bigamy, in the form in which Genesis represents it as forced on Jacob, namely, the simultaneous marriage with two sisters, was afterwards expressly forbidden in the law, Lev. xviii. 18 (comp, § 103, with note 3). In general, monogamy remained predominant among the people of Israel ; in fact, the description of a wife in Prov. xii. 4, xix. 14, xxxi. 10 ff., and in particular the prophetic representation of the covenant between Jehovah and His people as marriage, clearly presuppose that monogamy is the rule (1).—The *possession of children*, by which the house is built up (Gen. xvi. 2, xxx. 3, etc.), is looked on as a *divine blessing* from Gen. i. 28 onwards. "From Jehovah" Eve obtains her first son, iv. 1 (2) ; it is God who in Seth gave her another seed instead of the murdered Abel, iv. 25 ; it is always God who makes a mother fruitful or unfruitful, xxix. 31, xxx. 2, and who will be entreated for the fruit of the body, xxv. 21, xxix. 32 f., xxx. 17, 22. Unfruitfulness is a heavy divine dispensation (xvi. 2, compare 1 Sam. i. 6 f.), indeed a dishonour to a woman, Gen. xxx. 23 ; childlessness is looked upon as the greatest misfortune to a house. Compare also such passages as Ps. cxxvii. 3 ff., cxxviii. 3 ff. (where a fruitful wife and a group of happy and growing children are designated as the crown of earthly joy), etc. To hinder fruitfulness is treated, Gen. xxxviii. 9 f., as an abomination worthy of death. There is in ancient Israel no trace of the custom of killing and exposing children to ward off the increase of family cares, which is so widely spread in heathenism (3). Thus the natural forms of human society are sanctified from the beginning by the religious point of view under which they are placed (4).

3. *All mankind is a connected race of brothers* (ἐξ ἑνὸς αἵματος, Acts xvii. 26). The differences between nations and orders of men do not rest on a diversity of physical origin, but upon the law of God, who made the nations to differ and set them their boundaries (Deut. xxxii. 8), and who reveals His retributive ordinances even in their natural character (Canaan, Moab, Ammon, etc.).

(1) There is a moral element contained in the fact that conjugal cohabitation is characterized as a knowing (the expression is certainly used a few times euphemistically of vicious human intermixture, but never of animal copulation)—namely, that it is "an act of personal freedom of will, and not the work of blind natural impulse, and contains moral self-decision as its presupposition" (Keil on Gen. iv. 1). Comp. § 81.

(2) That is, the communion with God in which man has remained even after the fall is testified to her by his birth. Gen. iv. 1 refers back to iii. 15 f., but still the passage by no means speaks of the birth of the God-man (as Luther translates it, "I have the man, the Lord").

(3) Compare Philo, *de Spec. leg.*, ed. Mang., ii. 318. This is also represented by heathen writers as something peculiar; see Tacitus, *Hist.*, v. 5.

(4) In answer to those who compare, for example, the importance of the family in the Old Testament, with the importance which the Indian religion lays on the possession of descendants because the condition of the dead ancestors depends on the offerings of their descendants, it is enough to point to Hegel's review of W. v. Humboldt's essay, "Ueber die unter dem Namen Bhagavad-Gita bekannte Episode des Mahabharata" (Hegel's *Werke*, xvi. p. 368 ff.).

III. THE CONSTITUENT PARTS OF MAN (1).

§ 70.

Body, Soul, Spirit.

Man, like all beings endowed with life, originated from *two elements*,—namely, from earthly material (עָפָר, אֲדָמָה), and from the Divine Spirit (רוּחַ), Gen. ii. 7, comp. Ps. civ. 29 f., cxlvi. 4. As in general נֶפֶשׁ, soul, originates in the בָּשָׂר, the flesh, by the union of spirit with matter, so in particular the human soul arises in the human body by the breathing of the divine breath (נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים) into the material frame of the human body. But although the life-spring of the רוּחַ, from which the soul arises, is common to man and beast, *both do not originate from it in the same way*. The souls of animals arise, like plants from the earth, as a consequence of the divine word of power, Gen. i. 24 (תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה). Thus the creating spirit which entered in the beginning, i. 2, into matter, rules in them; their connection with the divine spring of life is through the medium of the common terrestrial creation. But the *human soul* does not spring from the earth; it is created by *a special act of divine inbreathing;* see ii. 7 in connection with i. 26. The human body was formed from the earth before the soul; in it, therefore, those powers operate which are inherent to matter apart from the soul (a proposition which is of great importance, as Delitzsch rightly remarks). But the human body is still not an animated body; the powers existing in the material frame are not yet comprehended into a unity of life; the breath of life is communicated to this frame directly from God, and so the living man originates. According to the view of many, the specific difference between the life of the human soul and that of animals is expressed by the use of the term נְשָׁמָה in ii. 7 (2). This, however, cannot be established, for in vii. 22 ("All in whose nostrils was the breath of life died"), the exclusive reference of the expression נְשָׁמָה to man (as merely another expression for כֹּל הָאָדָם, ver. 21), coming between the general terms comprehending man and beast, which stand both before and after it, is not natural. In Deut. xx. 16, Josh. x. 40, xi. 11–14, כָּל־נְשָׁמָה denotes only men; but in these passages the special reference of the expression is made clear by the connection,—in the passage in Deuteronomy by ver. 18, and in the book of Joshua because from viii. 2 onward the cattle are excepted from the חֵרֶם. Otherwise one might as well prove from Josh. xi. 11, where כָּל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ is used exclusively of man, that the human soul alone is called נֶפֶשׁ. But it is correct that in the other places in the Old Testament in which נְשָׁמָה occurs it is never expressly used of the mere animal principle of life;

comp. Isa. xlii. 5, Prov. xx. 27, Job xxxii. 8, and Ps. cl. 6 (כֹּל הַנְּשָׁמָה). Thus the *substance of the human soul is the divine spirit of life uniting itself with matter;* the spirit is not merely the cause by reason of which the נֶפֶשׁ contained beforehand in the body becomes living, as Gen. ii. 7 has by some been understood (3). For in the עָפָר as such, in the structure of dust, there is, according to the Old Testament, as yet no נֶפֶשׁ, even latently. This is first in the בָּשָׂר, in the flesh; but the earthly materials do not become flesh until the רוּחַ has become united with it, vi. 17, vii. 15, Job xii. 10, xxxiv. 14 f. It is no proof against this (as has further been objected) that in some passages (Lev. xxi. 11; Num. vi. 6), the dead body from which, according to Gen. xxxv. 18, the soul has departed, is called נֶפֶשׁ מֵת before it crumbles to dust. I believe this expression is to be understood as a euphemistic metonymy, just as we speak of a dead person without meaning to say that the personality lies in the body; or perhaps in this designation of a dead person the impression is expressed which the corpse makes immediately after death, as if the element of the soul had not yet entirely separated itself (thus Delitzsch) (4). But as the soul sprang from the spirit, the רוּחַ, and contains the substance of the spirit as the basis of its existence, the *soul exists and lives also only by the power of the* רוּחַ; in order to live, the soul which is called into existence must remain in connection with the source of its life. "God's spirit made me" (רוּחַ אֵל עָשָׂתְנִי), says Job, xxxiii. 4, "and the breath of the Almighty animates me" (וְנִשְׁמַת שַׁדַּי תְּחַיֵּנִי, with the imperfect). The first sentence expresses the way in which the human soul is called into being; the second, the continuing condition of its subsistence. By the withdrawing of the רוּחַ the soul becomes wearied and weak, till at last in death it becomes a shadow, and enters the kingdom of the dead (comp. § 78); while by the רוּחַ streaming in, it receives vital energy. With this explanation the *Old Testament usage* in connection with the terms נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ becomes intelligible. In the soul, which sprang from the spirit, and exists continually through it, lies the *individuality*,—in the case of man his *personality*, his *self*, his *ego;* because man *is* not רוּחַ, but *has* it—he *is soul.* Hence only נַפְשִׁי, נַפְשְׁךָ, can stand for egomet ipse, tu ipse, etc., not רוּחִי, רוּחֲךָ, etc. (not so in Arabic); hence "soul" often stands for the whole person, Gen. xii. 5, xvii. 14, Ezek. xviii. 4, etc. When man is exhausted by illness, his רוּחַ is corrupted within him, Job xvii. 1 (רוּחִי חָבֵלָה), so that the soul still continues to vegetate wearily. When a person in a swoon comes to himself again, it is said his *spirit* returns to him, 1 Sam. xxx. 12 (וַתָּשָׁב רוּחוֹ) compared with Judg. xv. 19. But when one dies, it is said the *soul* departs, Gen. xxxv. 18; his *soul* is taken from him, 1 Kings xix. 4, Jonah iv. 3. When a dead person becomes alive again, is is said the *soul* returns again, 1 Kings xvii. 22 (וַתָּשָׁב נֶפֶשׁ). It is said of Jacob, whose sunken vital energy revived when he found his son again, that his *spirit* was quickened, Gen. xlv. 27 (וַתְּחִי רוּחַ). On the contrary, of one who is preserved in life it is said, חָיְתָה נֶפֶשׁ, [the soul lives] Jer. xxxviii. 17–20. When God rescues one from the jaws of death, it is said, Ps. xxx. 4, "Thou hast brought up my *soul* out of Sheol;" comp. Ps. xvi. 10 (5).—Man perceives and thinks by virtue of the *spirit* which animates him (Job xxxii. 8; Prov. xx. 27); wherefore it is said in 1 Kings x. 5, when the Queen of Sheba's comprehension was brought to a stand, that "there was no spirit in her more" (לֹא־הָיָה בָהּ עוֹד רוּחַ); but the

perceiving and thinking *subject* itself is the נֶפֶשׁ (comp. § 71). The impulse to act proceeds from the רוּחַ, Ex. xxxv. 21; hence one who rules himself is a מֹשֵׁל בְּרוּחוֹ, Prov. xvi. 32. But the acting subject is not the רוּחַ, but the נֶפֶשׁ; the *soul* is the subject which sins, Ezek. xviii. 4, etc. Love and attachment are of course a thing of the *soul*, Gen. xxxiv. 3 (וַתִּדְבַּק נַפְשׁוֹ) and ver. 8 (חָשְׁקָה נַפְשׁוֹ); and so in Cant. v. 6, the words of the beloved, נַפְשִׁי יָצְאָה, cannot be explained, "I was out of my senses" (as De Wette thinks), but the bride feels as if her very personality had gone forth from her to follow and seek her beloved. In many cases, indeed, נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ stand indifferently, according as the matter is looked upon—that is, to use Hofmann's words (*Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 296), according as "the personality is named after its special individual life, or after the living power which forms the condition of its special character." Thus it may be said on the one hand, "Why is thy *spirit* so stubborn?" (מַה־זֶּה רוּחֲךָ סָרָה), 1 Kings xxi. 5; on the other hand, "Why are thou so bowed down, O my *soul?*" (מַה־תִּשְׁתּוֹחֲחִי נַפְשִׁי), Ps. xlii. 12. Of impatience it may be said, "The *soul* is short" (וַתִּקְצַר נֶפֶשׁ), Num. xxi. 4, and "shortness of the *spirit*" (קְצַר רוּחַ), Ex. vi. 9; compare Job xxi. 4. Trouble of heart is "bitterness of the *spirit*" (מֹרַת רוּחַ), Gen. xxvi. 35; and of the *soul* (הֵמַר נַפְשׁוֹ), Job xxvii. 2, it is said וַתִּפְעֶם רוּחוֹ, Gen. xli. 8, and נַפְשִׁי נִבְהֲלָה מְאֹד, Ps. vi. 4. Compare with this in particular the climax in Isa. xxvi. 9 (6). From all this it is clear that the Old Testament does not teach a *trichotomy* of the human being in the sense of *body*, *soul*, *and spirit*, as being originally three co-ordinate elements of man; rather the *whole man is included in the* בָּשָׂר and נֶפֶשׁ (body and soul), *which spring from the union of the* רוּחַ *with matter*, Ps. lxxxiv. 3, Isa. x. 18; comp. Ps. xvi. 9. The רוּחַ *forms in part the substance of the soul individualized in it, and in part*, after the soul is established, *the power and endowments which flow into it* and can be withdrawn from it (7), (8).

(1) Besides the books already quoted in § 67, cf. Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. pp. 17–25; my *Commentationes ad theologiam biblicam pertinentes*, 1846, p. 11 ff.; H. A. Hahn, *V. T. sententia de natura hominis exposita*, 1846; several sections of Böttcher's comprehensive but unfinished work, *De inferis rebusque post mortem futuris*, i., 1846; in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*, the article "Geist des Menschen," by Auberlen [with additions in the 2d ed. by Cremer]; and the article "Herz im bibl. Sinn," by myself, [with add. in 2d ed. by Delitzsch; also Wendt, *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im bibl. Sprachgebrauch*, Gotha, 1878.]

(2) This is the view of several Rabbins, and of Beck and Hahn among modern writers. There were even Rabbins who connected the word נְשָׁמָה with שָׁמַיִם.

(3) Thus Böttcher and others; the former in a review of my *Commentationes*, in the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1846, No. 254 f., p. 1013 ff.

(4) Delitzsch, *System of Biblical Psychology*, p. 524.

(5) Ps. xvi. 10: "Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol;" compare also § 78.

(6) Isa. xxvi. 9: "In my *soul* I long after Thee (נַפְשִׁי אִוִּיתִךָ); yea with my *spirit* (אַף־רוּחִי) in my inward parts I seek Thee (אֲשַׁחֲרֶךָּ)." The second sentence does not say the same as the first, but, as shown by אַף, it ascends higher—"Yea, with my spirit," with the *whole strength* of my inward life.

(7) In all ages a few passages in the Old Testament have been supposed by some to teach a pre-existence of the soul. The main passages adduced are Ps. cxxxix. 15 and Job i. 21. But in the former passage, an *abbreviated comparison* is without doubt to be assumed. "When I was formed in the depths of the earth,"

stands for "in such concealment, in a place as dark as the depths of the earth" (description of the mother's womb). In Job i. 21, "Naked came I forth from my mother's womb, and naked do I return thither," is a kind of zeugma. The correspondence is between the mother's womb in the proper sense and the mother's womb in the figurative sense, namely, the mother earth; for the condition before birth, and the condition in the grave and in the kingdom of the dead, correspond. —On the other hand, in the book of Wisdom, viii. 20, there is undeniably a thought borrowed from Plato.

(8) [According to Wendt (p. 27) the view given in the text of the relation of spirit and soul rests upon an unauthorized assumption, viz., that the Old Testament writers had one and the same psychological system. But what is assumed is, simply the existence of a distinct conception, a consciousness of the being of the spirit and the soul and of the relation of the two, and consequently a few psychological intuitions. This assumption is sustained by the *usus loquendi* pointed out in the text. According to Wendt, both ideas cover the same ground, namely, the vital energies of the human spirit, but apprehended from different points of view. Regarded from the religious point of view, as not earthly but divine, they are called *spirit:* from the anthropological, as presenting the immaterial nature of man in opposition to his material bodily nature, they are called *soul.* That *under certain circumstances* the words may cover the same ground is shown in the text. But in general such is not the case. This is evident from the fact that in the Old Testament man himself is designated as soul, but not as spirit. What Wendt says in comparing "spirit" and "heart" (see especially p. 31): "spirit is the mental energy which, partly as disposition, partly as character, impresses its distinct form upon all individual utterances of feeling, thought, and will," shows clearly enough that "spirit" covers more ground than "soul." The antithesis of the religious and anthropological mode of thought is here quite remote, and yet we could not, in expressing what belongs here, instead of spirit say, soul. The correctness of this antithesis is quite questionable. The attempt to defend it by appealing to Job xii. 10 is not exactly happy. And how can this antithesis be maintained in view of the fact that the soul in numberless passages appears as the subject of religious feelings and acts (cf. § 71)? Comp. also against Wendt the art. of Cremer already mentioned, whose position, "that the spirit is the principle of the soul, immanent in the life of the individual, but not the divine principle of life, identical with it," agrees with the view presented in the text. See also Prof. C. M. Mead, *The Soul Here and Hereafter*, 1879.—D.]

§ 71.

The Heart, and its Relation to the Soul.

The soul of man has a double sphere of life: first, *it is anima, that on which rests the life belonging to the senses,* נֶפֶשׁ הַבָּשָׂר, *the soul of the flesh in the more limited sense.* As such it acts in the *blood*, and supplies life to the body through the blood; hence the proposition, Lev. xvii. 11, נֶפֶשׁ הַבָּשָׂר בַּדָּם הִוא, "The soul of the flesh is in the blood" (1); indeed, it is said directly, "The blood is the soul," Gen. ix. 4, Lev. xvii. 14, Deut. xii. 23. Still this does not mean that the soul of the flesh does not act also in respiration and nourishment. The fundamental meaning of נֶפֶשׁ is "that which breathes," "the breath," Job xli. 13; and hence, as some passages speak of a *streaming forth* of the soul in the blood (Isa. liii. 12, and elsewhere), so in others the *breathing forth* of the soul is spoken of, Jer. xv. 9, Job xxxi. 39, etc. But secondly, נֶפֶשׁ is not simply *anima*, not simply the principle of life belonging to the senses, but it is at the same time *animus,—the subject of all the acts of knowing, feeling, and willing*, and especially the subject of

those acts and states of man that refer to his communion with God—Deut. iv. 29, vi. 5, Isa. lxi. 10, Ps. xix. 8, xlii. 2 sq., and numberless other passages (2).

In both its relations, as *anima* and *animus*, *the soul centres in the heart*, לֵב or לֵבָב, which often interchanges with קֶרֶב; which, however, designates in a wider sense the whole cavity of the breast, with the intestines. The heart, as the central organ of the circulation of the blood (3), forms the focus of the life of the *body*; whence, for example, the strengthening of the body by nourishment is called supporting the heart, סָעַד לֵב, Gen. xviii. 5, Judges xix. 5, Ps. civ. 15; and, on the other hand, exhaustion of physical vital energy is designated as a drying up or melting away of the heart, Ps. cii. 5, xxii. 15, and the like. But the heart is also the centre of all *spiritual* functions. Everything spiritual, whether belonging to the intellectual, moral, or pathological sphere, is appropriated and assimilated by man in the heart as a common meeting-place, and is again set in circulation from the heart. All vital motions of the soul proceed from the heart, and react upon it, so that the declaration, Prov. iv. 23, "Above all that thou hast to guard, keep thy heart; for from it are the issues of life," is universal. In particular, the heart (the חַדְרֵי בֶטֶן, Prov. xx. 27) is the place in which the process of *self-consciousness* goes on,—in which the soul is at home with itself, and is conscious of all its doing and suffering as its own (4). The heart, therefore, is also the organ of the conscience, Job xxvii. 6. But in general, when a man turns his thoughts within, or appropriates anything, designs anything, is busy with any plan or resolution, this happens in the heart (5). Hence expressions such as יָדַע עִם לֵבָב, Deut. viii. 5; הֵשִׁיב אֶל-לִבּוֹ, Isa. xliv. 19, etc.; אָמַר אֶל-לִבּוֹ,—this even of God,—Gen. viii. 21; שִׂים עַל-לֵב, בְּלִבְּכִי, עִם לִבִּי, מַשְׂכִּיּוֹת לֵבָב, חָיַח בְּלִבִּי, Ps. lxxiii. 7; מַעֲרְכֵי-לֵב, Prov. xvi. 1. But the heart is the organ not simply of those acts of consciousness which are purely inward, but also of the act of *knowing in general*, which is essentially an appropriation, so that לֵב has often exactly the meaning of intellect, insight; for example, אֲנָשֵׁי לֵבָב, *viri cordati*, Job xxxiv. 10; סָכָל = אֵין-לֵב, Jer. v. 21, comp. Prov. xvii. 16, רְחַב לֵב, 1 Kings v. 9 (6), also of God; כַּבִּיר כֹּחַ לֵב, Job xxxvi. 5.

Now, because the heart is the central point of the person's life, the work-place for the personal appropriation and assimilation of everything spiritual, the *moral and religious* condition of man lies in the heart. Only what enters the heart possesses moral worth, and only what comes from the heart is a moral product. A man's whole life as an individual, as well as all his separate personal acts, derive their character and moral significance from the quality and contents of the heart, in virtue of the necessary connection which subsists between the centre and the periphery (7). Because of this, man is characterized by his *heart* in all his habitual and moral attributes. We read in 1 Kings v. 12, Prov. x. 8, etc., of a wise heart; in Ps. li. 12, of a pure heart; in Gen. xx. 5 f., etc., of an honest and righteous heart; and so, on the other hand, in Ps. ci. 4, of a perverse heart; in Jer. iii. 17, etc., of a wicked and stubborn heart; and in Ezek. xxxviii. 2, etc., of a haughty heart (8). The doctrine of the יֵצֶר לֵב, the devising of the heart, is set forth in Genesis viii. 21, in opposition to the superficial doctrine which makes man in a moral sense an indifferent being, in whose choice it lies each moment to be either good or bad; and so this book represents

sin as a principle which has penetrated to the centre, and from thence corrupts the whole circuit of life (9). Accordingly the human heart is characterized in Jer. xvii. 9 as "deceitful (עָקֹב, properly rugged, the opposite of יָשָׁר) above all things, and mortally diseased (אָנֹשׁ)," so that God alone (but He completely, Prov. xv. 11) is able to fathom the depths of its perverseness ; and hence the prayer in Ps. cxxxix. 23 f. Hence all *revelation* addresses itself to the *heart*, even the revelation of law, Deut. vi. 6 ; for it demands love to God from the whole *heart*, and, starting from this centre, also from the whole soul ; compare xi. 18. The condition of insusceptibility for what is divine is called the uncircumcised heart (עָרֵל), Lev. xxvi. 41, Deut. x. 16, comp. Ezek. xliv. 9 ; and callousness in sin is a hardening, an obduracy of the heart—Ex. iv. 21, and many other passages (10). And because of this the work of revelation is directed to renewing man from the heart ; and its aim, Deut. xxx. 6, is to circumcise the heart—to establish God's will within the heart, Jer. xxxi. 33.—Also on man's side the process of salvation begins in the heart. *Faith*, in which man's personal life in its deepest basis takes a new direction, belongs entirely to the sphere of the heart, and is described as a making fast (from the root-meaning of הֶאֱמִין), a making strong (הֶאֱמִין, Ps. xxvii. 14, xxxi. 25), a staying of the heart (compare especially Ps. cxii. 7 f.) on that foundation which is God, the צוּר לֵבָב Himself, Ps. lxxiii. 26 ; compare the same view in the New Testament—for example, Rom. x. 9 f., Acts viii. 37.—On the contrary, *frames of mind* and *emotions* are just as often predicated of the *soul* as of the heart, according as they are understood as something which embraces the whole personality of man, or as a state ruling his inmost heart. In the Old Testament, grief and care, fear and terror, joy and confidence, tranquillity and contentment, are referred sometimes to the heart and sometimes to the soul ; compare the union of the two expressions, Deut. xxviii. 65, and also Prov. xii. 25, Eccles. xi. 10, Jer. xv. 16, 1 Sam. ii. 1, Ps. xxviii. 7, on the one hand, and Ex. xxiii. 9 (where Luther translates נֶפֶשׁ by heart), Ps. vi. 4, xlii. 6 f., Isa. lxi. 10, Ps. lxii. 2, cxxxi. 2, cxvi. 7, on the other. In these points usage has established peculiar distinctions, so that, for example, as a rule, כָּרַר and its derivatives are connected with נֶפֶשׁ, and שָׂמַח and its derivatives with לֵב, etc. (11). However, נֶפֶשׁ, and not לֵב, is generally used if the acts spoken of are those in which the subject is *in motion toward an object*. Jer. iv. 19 is instructive in this connection (12). But it is specially to be remarked that in the idea of נֶפֶשׁ, the character of desire is obviously that which predominates and reaches farthest ; and here the connection of desire with the breath and with breathing must not be overlooked. Certainly the impulses by which man allows himself to be determined (comp. Ex. xxxv. 5, xxii. 29), the controlling purpose which rules him, the views which he cherishes, the desire which he inwardly cherishes, are matters of the heart (comp. Ezek. xi. 21, xx. 16, xxxiii. 31 ; Deut. xi. 16 ; Job. xxxi. 7, ix. 27 ; Ps. lxvi. 18 ; Prov. vi, 25) ; but as soon as the tendency of the will extends to the *utterance* of the desire, נֶפֶשׁ generally comes in, and the stem אָוָה, together with its derivatives, is almost exclusively connected with נֶפֶשׁ, (13). Indeed, it is well known that נֶפֶשׁ is sometimes placed for desire or inclination itself ; compare in particular, Eccles. vi. 7, 9, Prov. xiii. 2 (14).

(1) Compare the theory of sacrifice, § 127.

(2) The Old Testament and the Homeric anthropology offer parallels of the highest interest, but here there is a remarkable difference between the two: the Homeric *ψυχή* is impersonal,—simply the sensuous principle of life: the spiritual elements have their seat in the *φρένες*. Compare Nägelsbach, *Homerische Theol.* p. 380 ff., and my *Commentationes*, p. 11 f.

(3) The pitcher at the fountain of blood, Eccles. xii. 6. See on this passage Delitzsch, *l.c.*, p. 270 f.

(4) "In corde actiones animæ humanæ ad ipsam redeunt," says Roos, *Fundam. psychol. ex. s. scr.*, p. 99, concisely and strikingly.

(5) Roos, *l.c.*: "Dum ipsa [anima] sibi aliquid ostendit ac proponit, ad cor suum loqui dicit r. Dum suarum actionum sibi conscia est, et illarum innocentiam vel turpitudinem ipsa sentit, id ad cor refertur. Anima humana ut *ψυχή* suavia appetit, ut ispiritus scrutatur, etc. *Sed quatenus cor habet, ipsa novit, se hoc agere, et ideas reflexas habet.*"

(6) By this Ps. cxix. 32 is to be explained (differently by Hengstenberg), and similarly the passage 2 Kings v. 26, which has been understood in so many different ways. The LXX often put *νοῦς* for לֵב, Ex. vii. 23, Isa. x. 7, etc. Compare, too, on the close connection of the two notions, Beck, *Christl. Lehrwissenschaft*, i. p. 233. There are indeed exceptions. The *soul*, too, is put as the subject of insight, Prov. xix. 2, Ps. cxxxix. 14; the thoughts that move man are called a speaking and meditating of the soul, Lam. iii. 20, 24, 1 Sam. xx. 4; men form imaginations in the soul, Esth. iv. 13, and cherish plans there, Ps. xiii. 3, etc. Still there are comparatively very few such passages (see Delitzsch, *l.c.*, p. 234); and it would seem sometimes, as in the last-cited passage, that the mention of the soul is occasioned mainly by the parallelism, which demands a second expression.

(7) The divine judgment being passed on man not according to what he appears to be, but according to what he is, is described as a looking on the heart, 1 Sam. xvi. 7, Jer. xx. 12; a knowing and trying the heart, 1 Kings viii. 39; Prov. xvii. 3; Ps. vii. 10, xvii. 3; Jer. xi. 20.—Even of God it is said, Lam. iii. 33, "He does not afflict men מִלִּבּוֹ," in order to express the difference between that which is rooted in His being and his appearance as apprehended by man.

(8) In all such connections נֶפֶשׁ is not readily used. The LXX are not so rigorous in this usage; comp. Böttcher, *De inferis*, § 41 (but there are various readings in some passages there quoted). The usage in the book of Wisdom is peculiar; it speaks of holy souls (vii. 27), and on the contrary of *κακότεχνος ψυχή*, into which wisdom does not enter, and of *εὐθύτης ψυχῆς* (ix. 3, etc.). This usage is connected with the writer's peculiar theory of the differences of natural character in souls, indicated in viii. 19.

(9 and 10) See the doctrine of sin, § 75 and § 76.

(11) The passage Prov. xiv. 10 is interesting in this connection: "The heart knoweth the sadness of its soul; in its joy also may no stranger mingle."

(12) According to Jer. iv. 19, the soul hears the tumult of war, and on this the *heart* is moved by sorrow and fear.

(13) תַּאֲוֹת לֵב is found only in Ps. xxi. 3. Compare, further, passages like Ps. lxxxiv. 3, cxix. 20, 81, Isa. xxvi. 8 f.

(14) By this, הַרְחִיב נֶפֶשׁ, Isa. v. 14, Hab. ii. 5, and רְחַב נֶפֶשׁ, Prov. xxviii. 25, are to be explained; the latter is different from רְחַב לֵב, Ps. ci. 5, which Ewald incorrectly translates "of greedy heart," since, like Prov. xxi. 4, it designates puffed up, conceited security.—In conclusion, the question would still remain to be taken into consideration, in what relation the heart, as the focus and centre of the *spiritual* life of the soul, stands to the heart as the centre of *physical* life. But this question can be satisfactorily discussed only in connection with a comprehensive examination of the relation of the body and soul in general. Here it can only be briefly remarked, that according to Holy Writ there is not merely a parallelism between the body and soul, in virtue of which what is bodily stands simply as the symbol of spiritual occurrences, but as the soul which supports the personality

is the same as that which rules in the blood and in the breath, so also in its higher functions the bodily organs have a real share. Now, with the well-known experience that affections and passions affect the intestines, that the beating of the heart in particular is modified by all passionate excitement, no one will find simple tropes where the Psalmist says (Ps. xxxix. 4), "My heart was hot within me;" or Jer. xx. 9, "It was in my heart like a burning fire;" comp. iv. 19, xxiii. 9. But there are two remarkable points in biblical anthropology: first, the specific relation in which the Holy Scriptures place separate parts of the intestines to specific emotions (see what Delitzsch, *l.c.* 213 ff. says on the biblical meaning of כְּלָיוֹת, the liver, the kidneys); and secondly, the way in which the heart, and not the head and the brain, is referred to in connection with acts of knowing and willing (the book of Daniel is the first to speak of "the visions of the head"). It is well known that the view of the entire ancient world agrees with the Bible in this. As regards the Homeric doctrine (*e.g.* the meaning of *κῆρ*, *κραδίη*), compare Nägelsbach's *Homer. Theol.* 1st ed. p. 332 ff., 2d ed. p. 384 ff.; remember also the Roman usage of words like *cordatus*, *recordari*, *vecors*, *excors*, and others; compare in particular Cicero, *Tusc.* i. 9, 18, and also Plato, *Phæd.* c. 45, and the commentators on this passage, etc. The spiritual significance of the heart cannot—as Delitzsch, *l.c.*, p. 307 ff., rightly maintains—be simply referred to the fact that the heart is the centre of the circulation of the blood. The way in which Delitzsch, p. 301 f., has adduced the phenomena of somnambulism in illustration of the matter deserves notice; but physiology has hitherto given almost no answer to the questions that here suggest themselves.

SECOND CHAPTER.

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN IN REFERENCE TO THE CONTRADICTORY ELEMENTS WHICH ENTERED BY SIN INTO ITS DEVELOPMENT.

I. THE PRIMITIVE STATE OF MAN.

§ 72.

The constitution of man in his primitive state we learn in part from the second chapter of Genesis, and in part by arguing backward from the change occasioned by sin. Thus the following points are reached: *innocence and child-like intercourse with God, harmonious relation to nature*, and, *conditionally*, *exemption from death.*

1. Man was created *good*, Gen. i. 31—that is, conformed to the divine aim. But as the good in him is not yet developed into free self-determination, he does not as yet know the good as good (compare iii. 5). This is the condition of child-like *naïveté* and innocence (compare Deut. i. 39). It is characterized in Gen. ii. 25 by the circumstance that shame was not yet awakened. Hence, in the first place, the conception of the original state as a *created* condition of *sapientia* and *sanctitas* contradicts the statement in Genesis; it would be much more in the sense of the Old Testament to say, as Eccles. vii. 29 expresses it: "God made man יָשָׁר (right)." But in the second place, the view that the original state was only *an absence of actual sin*, in the sense either of a state of pure indifference, or a state in which the evil was already latent, so that in the Fall the disposition which already

existed in man only came forth, is equally irreconcilable with Genesis. The account of the origin of sin in Gen. iii. is thoroughly opposed to all doctrines according to which the evil in man is to be looked on as a *necessary* factor in man's development (see § 73).

2. In the primitive condition, man lives in undisturbed and peaceful union with nature and with God. The latter is made especially clear by the contrast in Gen. iii. 8 ff., in which it is implied that the fear, which in man's present condition predominates in his relation to the Divinity, is not the normal relation. The peaceful relation of man with *nature* is taught partly in the description of the life in Paradise in general, and partly in the contrast between the present relation of man to nature and his condition before sin, since man must now make nature of service to him by toiling and struggling (iii. 17 ff., v. 29), and since he exercises his dominion over the animals by deeds of violence and destruction of life, ix. 2 f. (a passage which stands in contrast to i. 29) (1). Hence *prophecy* has depicted the termination of this hostile relation in its description of the time of salvation (in the well-known passages, Isa. xi. 6-8, lxv. 25).

3. Lastly, in Gen. ii., immortality is ascribed to man, but conditionally, in the sense of *posse non mori*. This is denied by many. Certainly the idea, that if man did not sin he should never die, does not necessarily lie in the words, Gen. ii. 17, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die;" the words, taken by themselves, might mean only a quick and early death. But it is quite clear from iii. 22 that, according to the sense of the record, the possibility of reaching immortality was annexed to the life in Paradise, and that immortality was destined for man so far as he should live in unbroken communion with God. And iii. 19 (2) does not mean, as many expositors have maintained, that by nature man *must* die; the words only give the reason why the end of man's life, when once decreed, is brought about in the manner described as a dissolution of the body (3).

(1) In Gen. i. 29 man is still restricted to vegetable nourishment. The power to kill animals is not given him till chap. ix.

(2) Gen. iii. 22: "That he may not take of the tree of life, and live *to eternity*." Ver. 19: "Till thou returnest again to the earth, for out of it wast thou taken; dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."—Particulars on the last quoted passage in § 77.

(3) It may be asked why the Old Testament refers so little to the primitive state? This question has been very well answered by Gustav Baur, in his treatise, "Die alttest. und die griechische Vorstellung vom Sündenfalle," in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1848. He says, p. 360: "The lost Paradise lying in the past is not further regarded by the religion of Israel, which forgets what is behind, and reaches forward to what is before, pursuing the aim of a *future* and blessed communion with God, which is placed before it; instead of idly mourning over the lost golden time, it rather strives, filled, purified and strengthened by the Spirit of God, to regain Paradise."

II. OF SIN.

1. THE ORIGIN OF SIN.

§ 73.

The Formal Principle of Sin.

The way in which both the *formal* and the *material principle* of sin are to be comprehended according to the Old Testament is embodied in the history of the Fall (Gen. iii.) In this (entirely symbolical) account the following doctrines are taught:

1. Man can pass from the state of innocence into the possession of moral character only *by, an act of self-determination.* For this it is first necessary for him to distinguish his will, in which till then the good was immediately placed [or, in other words, which instinctively chose the good,] from the good itself, and so to obtain the conception *of something not good* (רַע טוֹב וָרָע, ii. 17). Hence the good is placed before him objectively, in the form of a *command*, ii. 16 f. But the meaning of the story is not (as some modern theologians have understood it) that it was intended that man should *transgress* the law, because, as Bruno Bauer, for example (*Die Religion des A. T.* i. p. 23), has expressed it, the knowledge of the good is possible only when the subject *distinguishes itself from the good* —that is, knows itself as sinful. The meaning of the record is rather, that if the will is objectively confronted by what is good, and it thereupon distinguishes itself from the good, still this does not involve a decision of the will *against* the good. This is taught by the record when it does not represent the will of man as immediately reacting against the express command, but refers the first impulse to a decision against the command to the operation of an *influence from without*, and represents the woman (iii. 1–3) as at first still acknowledging the obligatory force of the divine command. This also excludes, according to the Old Testament, the supposition that man has a *conscience* only in so far as he knows himself to be sinful (as has been maintained from a Hegelian standpoint). For (1) when the woman, iii. 2 f., remembers the divine command, and knows that she is bound by it, and thus acknowledges its obligatory force, she has not yet sinned, and yet she shows that she has a conscience. Hence it follows that, according to the Old Testament, *sin is not* a *necessary factor in the development of man*, but a product of free choice; as is also the case afterward, though only, as we shall see, in a relative sense, Deut. xxx. 15: "See, I have to-day set before thee life and what is good, death and what is evil." In opposition to this, such passages are cited from the later books as Job iv. 17 ff., xiv. 4, Ps. ciii. 10, 14, which, when looked at by themselves, might favor the supposition that sin is a necessary consequence of the finiteness of human nature; but these passages are to be understood from the standpoint of the present nature of man.

2. As has been said, the *first incitement* to transgress the command came *from without.* The story apparently presupposes *an ungodly principle which had already entered the world*, but does not give any further account of it. No further atten-

tion is paid to the *serpent*, and therefore it cannot be laid down as a doctrine of Mosaism that it was either *Satan* or a tool of Satan's, because, as we shall see hereafter, the doctrine of Satan does not appear in the Old Testament till much later, although it is probable that in the Azazel, Lev. xvi. 8 ff., a wicked demon is to be seen. On the other hand, Wisd. ii. 23 f. teaches that the seduction of the first man is the work of Satan ; and this is also taken for granted in the New Testament (2). But the chief thing in connection with this point in Gen. iii. is, that the seduction does *not at all act by compulsion on man*, but is successful only when man voluntarily ceases to resist temptation. Here there is an essential difference between the Old Testament account and the Zend doctrine according to which sin is *physically* inserted in man (3).

(1) Compare Nitzsch, *System of Christian Doctrine*, § 98, note.

(2) It is doubtful whether in John viii. 44, the ἀνθρωποκτόνος, refers to this ; for, comparing 1 John iii. 12, 15, we are inclined to interpret the passage about the murderer as referring to Cain's fratricide. But Rev. xii. 9, where the devil is called ὁ δράκων, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, refers to the Fall in Gen. iii. Compare, too, the allusion in Rom. xvi. 20 to Gen. iii. 15.

(3) In modern times there has been no lack of attempts to understand the matter *physically*, by making the tree of knowledge a *poisonous tree*. These are all additions to the Old Testament account.

§ 74.

The Material Principle of Sin. The Old Testament Names of Sin.

3. The following is the process of the origin of sin : First, *doubt* is awakened whether what God has commanded is really good, and along with this the command itself is exaggerated, Gen. iii. 1 (1). Distrust of God was first to be called up, as if He were an envious being who sought to keep man back in a lower stage ; and then ver. 4 proceeds to a decided denial of God's word. Only then, when *selfishness*, rebelling against God's will and God's word, has been awakened, does sensuous allurement, ver. 6, exert its power. In other words, the real principle of sin is, according to the Old Testament, *unbelief of the divine word*, *the selfish elevation of self-will above the divine will*, *and the presumptuous trampling upon the limits set by divine command*. The *senses* appear as occupying only a secondary place in the production of sin. Thus Gen. iii. disproves the doctrine so often advanced, especially in the Rabbinical theology, that according to the Old Testament the real principle of evil lies in matter, in the body (2). It is a *fundamental doctrine of the Old Testament* that evil is originally the denial of the divine will ; that sin is sin because man selfishly exalts himself above God and His will. The Old Testament knows of no evil which is merely men's wronging of each other, or a mere retardation of the development of human nature, simple weakness (3).—That the Old Testament sees the ground of all evil in the selfish transgression of bounds prescribed to man by God, is not to be explained by thinking of God as an *envious* being, but because He is the *Holy* One, and holiness as such (as has been already shown) cannot bear anything contradictory to it. The God who rules over the world in resistless omnipotence, giving measure and aim to all things, has no ground for envy like the *Greek* gods (4). It is preposterous to

take the words of Gen. iii. 22, "The man is become like one of us," as an expression of divine envy, as has been done by some expositors (*e.g.* P. v. Bohlen); it rather contains a mournful irony—man by the Fall has really reached what he was to reach, but in a wrong way, and to his hurt. In one sense the serpent, in the words "eritis sicut Deus," told the truth, for man has reached independence over against God. But still he was deceived and deluded, for it is only independence in evil. Instead of being raised to free communion with God, he is free to go upon ungodly paths. It is shown by the curse to which man is now subjected that the account does not in the least mean to speak of a *felix culpa*, of an *elevation* of man by sin (5).—Whether there are allusions to the story of the Fall in the other books of the Old Testament cannot be affirmed with entire certainty. Most probably there is such an allusion in Hos. vi. 7, where the rendering, "they transgressed the covenant *like Adam*," certainly deserves to be preferred to the other renderings,—"after the manner of men," or "like men of the mob," or "like a covenant with a man" (6). In Job xxxi. 33, too, the explanation, "If I had dissembled my transgressions like Adam" (referring to Adam's excuses for himself), is more probable than the other view, "after the manner of man." On the contrary, Isa. xliii. 27, "thy first father sinned," without doubt does not refer to Adam's fall; rather to Abraham, but probably to Jacob, the proper ancestor of the people.

The *Old Testament designations for sin* are to be understood in conformity with the account we have given of the principle of sin. (*a*) The most common expression is חַטָּא, חַטָּאת, first in Gen. iv. 7, or shorter, חֵטְא; it comprehends sins of weakness as well as sins of wickedness. The physical meaning of חָטָא is to miss the mark, Judg. xx. 16. חַטָּאת denotes *missing*, *deviation*, viz., from the divine way and the goal prescribed for man by the divine will; and חָטָא joined with לְ means to go astray from God, to deviate, to sin against Him. (*b*) The second expression, עָוֹן, means properly *crookedness*, *perversion*, *pravitas;* primarily it does not designate an action, but *the character of an action;* hence in Ps. xxxii. 5, עֲוֹן חַטָּאתִי. In the mouth of men of the world, Hos. xii. 9, the word means wrong in general (7). But since, according to Old Testament doctrine, there is no wrong which is not sin, עָוֹן is the *perversion of the divine law*, *ἀνομία*; then especially the *guilt of sin*, first in Gen. xv. 16, and so in many connections: נָשָׂא עָוֹן, to take away guilt; חָשַׁב עָוֹן, to impute guilt; כִּפֶּר עָוֹן, to forgive guilt. (*c*) In its intensification, sin becomes פֶּשַׁע, an expression which probably means properly *breach with God*, and hence *apostasy*, *rebellion against God;* for the stem פֶּשַׁע seems to be connected with פָּסַק, *rupit*. While חַטָּאת includes sins of negligence and weakness, *design* and *set purpose* are always implied in פֶּשַׁע. Job xxxiv. 37 may be regarded as the chief passage (8). Still it often stands side by side with עָוֹן and חַטָּאת, Ex. xxxiv. 7, Num. xiv. 18. (*d*) If the evil has become an *habitual feature of the disposition and of the actions*, it is רֶשַׁע. The רֶשַׁע is the opposite of צַדִּיק. Still this expression, like צַדִּיק, can be used in reference to a single case. The main notion in רֶשַׁע appears to be *stormy excitement* (connected by its root with רָגַז, etc., although the term is often explained otherwise); comp. passages like Job iii. 17, Isa. lvii. 20, etc. (*e*) Evil, as in itself *empty* and *worthless*, is called אָוֶן (also שָׁוְא, etc.).

(1) The passage Gen. iii. 1 must necessarily be thus explained: "Hath God said ye shall not eat of all the trees of the garden?" that is, of *no tree whatever*. לֹא is separated from כֹּל, and belongs to the verb. Comp. *οὐ πᾶς* in the New Testament.

(2) Compare, *e. g.*, Maimonides, *More Neboch.* iii. 8.—That Gen. vi. 3, which has also been appealed to, proves nothing for this is shown in § 77.

(3) In reference to the relation of the doctrine of sin in the Old Testament on the one hand, and among the Indo-Germanic peoples on the other hand, Grau has rightly found a cardinal point here. He says, (*Semiten und Indogermanen*, p. 94): "Sin is not merely a transgression of the bounds given in the nature and constitution of man; this is the purely earthly, philosophical notion reached by the Indo-German, whose thought does not go beyond the world. But sin is essentially a transgression of the law of God, an injury to the absolutely Holy Ego. From the former standpoint, when the limits which were passed are set up again, and the harm which was the consequence of the transgression is blotted out, the sin itself appears to be done away with. If, on the other hand, sin is committed against God, it is not something simply finite, something which the perpetrator can undo, but it is infinite guilt, because the injured person has an infinite value." [That sin is enhanced by being committed against God is an important truth, but to call it infinite because God is infinite, as is sometimes done in systems of theology, is certainly illogical.—D.]

(4) The Greek gods can exercise envy, because they do not stand in the relation of absolute superiority to men. The Hellenic doctrine of the origin of sin is expressed in the myth of Prometheus. There, indeed, the envy of the gods is an important element. In Mekone, men and gods gathered together in order to define their rights on both sides. On this occasion Prometheus was able to entrap Zeus. It is a struggle between the gods and men, which is something entirely different from the struggle known in the Old Testament. Compare the above-cited treatise of Gustav Baur, p. 347.

(5) On the connection of death and sin, see § 77.

(6) Ps. lxxxii. 7 does not speak in favor of the *second* explanation of כְּאָדָם in Hos. vi. 7, because there the contrast is different. The *third* explanation would be admissible only if הַמָּה referred to men of higher station—to priests and prophets; but it refers to Judah and Israel. Lastly, if according to the *fourth* explanation כְּאָדָם stood for אָדָם כִּבְרִית, the order of the words would be different.

(7) Hos. xii. 9: לֹא יִמְצְאוּ-לִי עָוֹן אֲשֶׁר-חֵטְא, "They find none iniquity in me that were sin."

(8) Job xxxiv. 37: יֹסִיף-עַל-חַטָּאתוֹ פִּשַׁע, "He adds to his sin rebellion."

2. THE STATE OF SIN.

§ 75.

Sin as an Inclination. Transmission of Sin.

In consequence of the Fall, sin appears as a *state* in mankind—that is, as an *inclination* which rules man, and as a common sinful life which is transmitted partly in mankind in general, and partly in an especial degree in particular races, and so subjects these to the curse of guilt and judgment.

1. After once appearing by the free act of man, sin does not remain in this isolation. The *second* sin, that of self-excuse and palliation of the offence, follows immediately on the first, the sin of disobedience, Gen. iii. 10. This is the רְמִיָּה (deceit), Ps. xxxii. 2, which, when sin has once entered, prevents the realization of earnest opposition thereto. As sin thus joins to sin, it becomes a *habitus*, and

in this way a definite feature of the heart, or, as it is termed, a יֵצֶר לֵב, imagination of the heart, an *inclination*, which gives a perverted tendency to man's will. Thus it is said before the flood, Gen. vi. 5: "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is only evil continually" (כָּל-יֵצֶר מַחְשְׁבֹת לִבּוֹ רַק רַע כָּל-הַיּוֹם); and after it again, viii. 21: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (יֵצֶר לֵב הָאָדָם רַע מִנְּעָרָיו). That this יֵצֶר is not to be understood simply as a physical disposition, as is taught by the Rabbinical theology (1), is shown by the more exact expression in vi. 5: יֵצֶר מַחְשְׁבֹת לִבּוֹ (comp. 1 Chron. xxviii. 9). Because this sinful inclination—this is the meaning of the variously explained passage Gen. viii. 21—cleaves to man from his youth, the human race would lie under a continual sentence of destruction if God gave severe justice its course. The ground for sparing him is, according to the context of that passage, that man still seeks communion with God, as is shown by sacrifice.—The natural striving of man against God's law—the stiff-neckedness and hardness of heart so often spoken of in the Pentateuch—is based on this sinful inclination. Therefore, when Israel promises to keep the divine law, the divine voice complains, Deut. v. 28, 29: "They have spoken right, but oh that they had a *heart* to fear me and keep all my commands."

2. That this sinful inclination is hereditary is indirectly contained in the passages cited, although it is not expressly said. It is also to be noticed, that Mosaism, although it derives the propagation of man's race from God's blessing, still regards all events and conditions which refer to birth and generation as requiring a purifying expiation; compare the law, Lev. xii. and xv., in which the thought lies that all these conditions are connected with the disturbance of sin. Hence Ps. li. 7 expresses the idea of the law: "Behold, I was born in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Even if this passage spoke only of a עָוֹן and חַטָּא of the *parents*, according to the explanation which is now more common, it would still follow, from the fact that the very origin of man is connected with sin, that even the newly born child is not free from sin; as Job xiv. 4 expresses it, "How can a clean thing come from an unclean? not one,"—a thought which is certainly connected with the passage in the Psalms. But there is nothing to prevent עָוֹן and חַטָּא in the passages in the Psalms being referred, as is done by Hitzig, to the child itself as soon as conceived and born; according to which, the passage says directly that evil is ingrown in man from the first moment of his origin (2).—This transmission of sin takes place with special intensity in *certain races, especially those that have fallen under the divine curse.* This is implied in the history of the Cainites, Gen. iv.; of Ham, and especially Canaan, from ix. 25 onward; of Moab and Ammon, from xix. 36 onward, etc.; but it is especially expressed in the repeated declaration that God visits the sins of the fathers on the third and fourth generation. For this point the main passages are: Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 7; Num. xiv. 18; Deut. v. 9. These passages do not mean to say (as it has often been misrepresented) that God punishes the sins of the fathers on *guiltless* descendants, as conversely He brings the blessing of pious fathers on the latest generations, even though they walk in the path of sin. This is not contained in Ex. xx. 5 f. (3). Even if (with the Vulgate,—"in . . . generationem eorum, qui oderunt me," Knobel, and others) we refer the לְשֹׂנְאָי simply to אָבוֹת, and understand it as a repetition

of the genitive,—"visiting the iniquity of the fathers—of the *fathers* who hate me," —it is not said that the sons are innocent; nothing at all is said concerning their character. But לְ does not resume the genitive again after עֲוֹן, for then it would stand after אֹבְת. From its position and parallelism with לְאֹהֲבַי, ver. 6, לְשֹׂנְאַי must rather be referred to fathers and sons together. The presupposition certainly is, that as a rule a moral condition of life is introduced by the father of the race, which continues to operate as a power in the family (4). Now, if the descendants continue in the sin of their ancestors, and fill up its measure (comp. Gen. xv. 16), then, even if the divine forbearance should wait till the third and fourth generation, they meet the judgment incurred by the common sins of the race; their sins and those of their fathers are punished at the same time upon them. For this idea compare the particularly instructive passage Lev. xxvi. 39: "They pine away in the lands of your foes for their iniquity; and also for the iniquity of their fathers which is among them, do they pine away." The possibility of abrogating the curse lying on a race, as in the case of Levi (comp. § 29 with note 2), or at least that some should be freed from it, is not here denied (compare the case of the Korahites). According to this, Ex. xx. 5 f. is not contradictory to Deut. xxiv. 16 (5); a passage which, moreover, mainly refers to the administration of penal justice by man (comp. 2 Kings xiv. 6). But if the prophets Jeremiah, xxxi. 29 f., and Ezekiel, chap. xviii. and xxxiii. 17 f., use the doctrine of Deuteronomy in reference also to the divine justice, they do not in so doing conflict with the proposition in Ex. xx. 5—which, indeed, is placed by Jeremiah himself, chap. xxxii. 18, beside the other, ver. 19 (comp. Lam. v. 7 with iii. 39 ff., where again both propositions are found); the prophets simply protest against the perverse application which the self-righteous people of their time made of that ancient declaration to palliate their guilt (6). The passages on both sides proceed from different points of view. If we proceed from the consideration of individuals, each one suffers for his own sin; but if we consider the species, the sin of each individual is the issue and continuance of the collective sin which had its origin in the sin of the fathers of the race.

(1) Compare Vitringa, *Observationes Sacræ*, iii. 8, p. 618.

(2) The Talmud, indeed, speaks of children born in holiness, but not the Old Testament. The divine endowment of some men in the womb (Jer. i. 5, etc.) is no argument against the universal sinfulness of man.

(3) Ex. xx. 5: "Thou shalt not worship them (the idols), for I, Jehovah, thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and fourth generation, לְשֹׂנְאָי."

(4) Compare Hävernick, *Theol. des A. T.*, 2d ed., edited by Schultz, p. 113: "It is to be regarded as an exception when a godless father has a virtuous son. That ethical states follow a rule is presupposed in the law; this it regards, so to speak, as the normal course of things in the sphere of wickedness."

(5) Deut. xxiv. 16: "The sons shall not be slain for their fathers' sake; each one shall die for his own sin."

(6) The Jews in Jer. xxxi. 29 interpreted it as meaning, as many Christian commentators have done: "The fathers ate sour grapes, and the children's teeth became blunt."

§ 76.

Antagonism of the Good and the Evil in Man. Degrees of Sin. Possibility of a Relative Righteousness.

Along with all this, the power of sin is represented as a power which may and should be resisted by man in the exercise of his freedom. And thus from man's own choice spring the various *degrees of sin*, which culminate in callousness; while, on the other hand, by submission to the word and will of the revealing God, a *godly life* in the midst of the sinful world is prescribed as possible, thus making a distinction between the righteous and the ungodly.

According to the Old Testament, the condition of man in consequence of the Fall is not that of an absolute subjection to sin, which destroys the power of resistance, but it is an *antagonism* between man's susceptibility to the good [in other words, between his reason and conscience pleading in favor of what is right.—D.] and the power of sin. The feeling of the contradiction now existing in man shows itself, Gen. iii. 7, in the awakening of shame, but iv. 6 f. is in this connection the main passage. It is to be explained thus: Jehovah said to Cain, "Why art thou wroth, and why has thy countenance fallen? Is it not so, if thou doest well, thy countenance is lifted up, but if thou doest not well, sin is before the door, as a lier in wait (1); his desire (sin's) is towards thee; but thou shouldst rule over him." Here are expressed the possibility and the duty of resisting the sinful inclination. The whole law rests on this presupposition (compare especially Deut. xxx. 11–20), though, at the same time (as we shall see presently), it is distinctly stated that the overcoming of the power of sin in man is not attained. But according as men seek or do not seek to rule over sin, there arises a difference of relation to God and a difference in the *degree* of sinfulness. This difference of degree is by no means to be resolved into the difference between the inner and outer, as if the decisive point were the external relation of man to the law; for, in Ex. xx. 17, wicked desire [coveting] is forbidden no less than wicked deeds, and the law demands more than mere outward conformity to the divine will. Though the civil and ceremonial ordinances must, in the nature of things, have in view primarily outward offences, still, in reference to individual sinful actions, they distinguish between sins committed through error and negligence (בִּשְׁגָגָה, Lev. iv. 2, 22, etc.; compare Num. xxxv. 22 ff.) and those committed with wicked intent (בְּיָד רָמָה, Num. xv. 30, etc.). But what the spirit of the Old Testament is in reference to the moral estimate of the whole man, is shown in sacred history by many examples. Moses—although even he, the faithful servant of God, was severely punished for sin—did not sin like Pharaoh, in whom God's judgments produced an appearance of repentance only till he could take breath. David, to the depth of whose fall corresponded a repentance just as deep, sinned differently from Saul, who was sorry for his sin because it brought disaster upon him. In short, the measure for the divine estimate of man lies in the uprightness and purity of the attitude of the heart towards God (תֹּם לֵבָב). The Old Testament calls the highest degree of sin *obduracy*, or *hardening* of the heart (חִזֵּק לֵב, Ex. iv. 21; אִמֵּץ, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 13; הַכְבִּיד, כָּבֵד, 1 Sam. vi. 6; הִקְשָׁה, Ps. xcv. 8, Prov. xxviii. 14,

for which we find also, to shut the heart, Isa. xliv. 18, to make fat, הַשְׁמֵן, vi. 10; comp. Ps. cxix. 70, to make the heart like a diamond, Zech. vii. 12). This is the condition in which a man, by continually cherishing sin, has [in a sense] lost the ability to withstand it; and it is added, that God can glorify Himself on such a one only by punishment. For it is God's ordinance, that as the power to do good grows by its exercise, so also sin is punished by continued sinning; compare Ps. lxxxi. 12 f. (2). This hardening is both a *divine act* and at the same time the *sinner's own act*, so that the two expressions are interchangeable; compare on the one side Ex. vii. 3 (אֲנִי אַקְשֶׁה אֶת-לֵב פַּרְעֹה), iv. 21. x. 20 (וַיְחַזֵּק יְהוָה), and on the other side, viii. 15, 28 (וַיַּכְבֵּד פַּרְעֹה אֶת-לִבּוֹ), ix. 34, xiii. 15 (comp. 1 Sam. vi. 6, Prov. xxviii. 14: מַקְשֶׁה לִבּוֹ יִפּוֹל בְּרָעָה, etc.). In the first case, hardening is the effect of the divine *wrath*. In this way the difficult and often misinterpreted passage, (Isa. lxiv. 4 (5), is to be explained. It is not, "Thou wast wroth because we sinned," but, "Thou wast wroth, and then we sinned; in those, *i.e.* in the ways of God, we sinned from time immemorial, and shall we be saved?" The passage refers to lxiii. 17, "Why dost Thou permit us to err from Thy ways, and hardenest our hearts not to fear Thee?" (3). But we must here note as essential, that the Old Testament (like the New) always speaks of hardening only in connection with a divine testimony in revelation—in reference to a divine revelation offered to the sinner, but rejected by him. This is applicable to *Pharaoh*, who sees the miracles of Moses, which forced even the Egyptian Magi to feel, Ex. viii. 19, "this is God's finger;" "but," it is continued, "Pharaoh's heart was hardened (וַיֶּחֱזַק לֵב-פַּרְעֹה)." The same thing is applicable to Israel in view of the divine guidance in the wilderness; and according to this also, that which is said of the *Canaanitish tribes* Josh. xi. 20 is to be explained: "For it was of Jehovah to harden their heart to strive with Israel, that He might destroy them, and they might find no grace." The Canaanitish tribes merited punishment on account of their idolatrous abominations; and now that this judgment was executed upon them in the fom of, extermination, it was effected by themselves in virtue of a divine ordinancer through their hardening themselves to do battle with Israel, for whom God manifestly fought. In such passages the point is not (as understood by Calvin and the Calvinists) a dark and hidden decree of reprobation, but a divine decree of judgment, well-grounded and perfectly manifest (4).—The course of this hardening is described in Isa. vi. 10; incapability to *hear* the divine word and to *see* God's ways (הַשְׁמֵן לֵב . . . וְאָזְנָיו הַכְבֵּד וְעֵינָיו הָשַׁע) connects itself with dulness of *heart* and this again reacts on the heart so that its insusceptibility becomes incurable.

On the other hand, in the midst of the sinful world, a *righteousness* (צְדָקָה) is attained by cheerful resignation to the divine will, and by the loyalty with which a man accepts the witness of God, given to him in accordance with the then stage of revelation; and thus the difference between the relatively righteous and unrighteous goes through all the different periods of revelation. Enoch walked with God, Gen. v. 22; Noah is regarded as righteous in the general corruption, vii. 1; Abraham believed the promise, and it was counted to him for righteousness, xv. 6 (5). But the Old Testament knows nothing of *absolutely righteous* persons (in the canonical books): "There is no one who hath not sinned," 1 Kings viii. 46; "Before Thee no living man is righteous," Ps. cxliii. 2; compare

Isa. xliii. 27, Prov. xx. 9, Eccles. vii. 20 (6). The *Mosaic law* attests this by excepting none from the need of atonement (7).

(1) הַטָּאת, in Gen. iv. 7, is [indeed] not masculine, but לִבְּךָ [here] stands as a substantive.

(2) Ps. lxxxi. 12 f. : "My people did not hearken to my voice, and Israel would not conform to my will. So I gave them up (וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ) to their hardness of heart, that they might walk in their own counsels."

(3) Isa. lxiv. 4 ; בָּנֶעָתָ at the beginning of the verse still depends on לוּא, lxiii. 19.—Ewald gives the meaning of אַתָּה קָצַפְתָּ וַנֶּחֱטָא most correctly, referring back to lxiii. 17 : "The longer God's wrath, *i.e.* calamity, lasts, the more rankly does sin grow and spread." Delitzsch explains : "and we stood as sinners."—בָּהֶם does not mean, as Ewald says, "upon them (the Israelites) continually," but בָּהֶם refers, as Maurer and Stier have correctly explained it, to the *ways of God* before named.—וְנִוָּשֵׁעַ is best understood as a question.

(4) Gustav Baur, in the essay, p. 349, cited in § 72, note 3, remarks, in reference to this Old Testament doctrine of the *hardening of the heart*, that "if in the Old Testament the divine government appears in the hardening of the heart in a way which seems to limit the free acts of men, this was because the idea which the Israelites had of God and the creation, from which human freedom necessarily follows, was not yet worked out in all directions with perfect clearness, nor brought into unison with the experiences of human life." This is decidedly incorrect. The remark would refer equally to the New Testament, which contains the very same doctrine. Human freedom has limits in reference to sin ; the New Testament, too, knows of a bondage to sin, and we cannot on this point speak of the Old Testament standpoint as narrow.

(5) Compare further on the doctrine of the righteousness of the law and of faith.

(6) Isa. xliii. 27 : "Thy first father has sinned, and thy intercessors were faithless to me."—Prov. xx. 9 : "Who can say, I have kept my heart clean, I am clean from my sin?"—Eccles. vii. 20 : "There is none righteous on earth, who doeth good and sinneth not."

(7) The apocryphal *Prayer of Manasseh* says in the notorious passage, ver. 8 : "Because Thou art a God of the righteous, Thou hast not appointed repentance to the righteous Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who did not sin against Thee." The passage is in direct opposition to Isa. xliii. 27, and it was perhaps on this account that even the Romish Church did not accept this prayer as a part of the Canon.

III. ON DEATH AND THE STATE AFTER DEATH (1).

§ 77.

The Connection between Sin and Death.

The consequence of sin is death. The proof of this lies in the fact that, as has been shown in § 72, *posse non mori* was attached to the life in Paradise. But the connection between sin and death is *positively* expressed in Gen. ii. 17 : "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die." The difficulty arising from these words from the fact that death did not really follow *immediately after the Fall* is not (as some propose) to be set aside by saying that יוֹם (day) denotes a longer time ; the eating and dying are, on the contrary, placed in immediate connection by the בְּיוֹם, etc. (for this expression ["in the day"] compare the quite similar passage 1 Kings ii. 37). Neither is it to be set aside by supposing (with Böttcher, Knobel, and others) that the threat in Gen. ii. 17 was not meant in the view of the narrator

to be serious (2); for, saying nothing of the fact that the Old Testament never makes God play with His words, death clearly appears, iii. 19, as the punishment designed. For the words עַד־שׁוּבְךָ [until thou return], etc., must not be understood of the term *up to which* the punishment which hung over man should continue—for in that case the reason which follows would be utterly superfluous—but the words tell in what way the punishment is to take place, and how it is to be executed. The issue of the punishment is at once placed foremost in the threat, ii. 17, as is generally the case in prophetical announcements. In reality, man entered on the path of death immediately on the commission of sin (3).—The *punishment of death is connected with disobedience, not with the effect of the fruit of the tree*, as many expositors infer from the contrast in iii. 22. The tree does not bear the name of the tree of death in contrast to the tree of life, but it is called the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The partaking of the fruit had death as its consequence solely because a decision of the will was involved in it. The intimate connection of sin and death is clear from vi. 3, though this passage primarily treats only of the shortening of the length of life through sin. This difficult passage is thus to be explained: (Jehovah declares) "My spirit shall not always strive with man; in his erring he is flesh; his days shall be a hundred and twenty years" (4). It is not necessary to assume that בָּשָׂר (flesh) stands here in the ethical sense of the New Testament σάρξ (5). The word is rather to be taken in its ordinary Old Testament meaning; compare Isa. xl. 6, Ps. lxxvii. 39, etc.: "in his erring he is flesh"—mortal, fleeting. According to this passage, the divine spirit of life which supports man is enfeebled by sin, and thus man's vital strength is destroyed; while, as Isaiah (lxiii. 10) expresses himself, the Spirit of God is grieved by sin; it is also repressed as the physical principle of life, and thus man is subject to mortality. The passages Num. xvi. 29, xxvii. 3, which are brought to bear on the proposition that death is the penalty of sin, admit of a different interpretation. Still in the first passage—"If these (Korah and his company) die like all men, וּפְקֻדַּת כָּל־הָאָדָם יִפָּקֵד עֲלֵיהֶם,"—the last words are certainly not to be explained, with Keil, "and the (protective) care extended to all men is exerted for them;" and scarcely either with Böttcher, "and a punishment of all the world"—that is, a usual punishment of death is decreed against them, such as commonly falls on criminals.—The sense probably is, if they die in the common way; and thus the common lot of death is called a penal visitation, which comes on all men (6). In reference to the second passage (where Zelophehad's daughters are introduced as speaking), the sense may be: "Our father was not among the company of Korah, so as to die because of his sin;" if so, חֶטְאוֹ refers to the sin of that conspiracy, and the passage is not relevant here. But even if we render "he was not in that company, but he died in his sin," it is very questionable whether חֶטְאוֹ should here be referred to the common sinfulness of man, and not to the general sin of the nation, which brought about the death of that whole generation in the wilderness. Lastly, we have to notice the passage in the Psalm, of Moses xc. 7–10: "For we are consumed in Thine anger, and by Thy wrath are we troubled. Thou settest our iniquities before Thee, our secret faults in the light of Thy countenance; for all our days pass away in Thine anger," etc. This passage does not primarily speak of death in general, but only of early death—

the brevity and transientness of life as the punishment of sin. But still this passage does show how the Old Testament connected death with sin; and this serves, at the same time, to explain why the *law*, Num. xix. (compare also v. 2 f.), demands a *purifying propitiation* for everything which comes into contact with a corpse, although at the same time burial is considered so high a duty of affection. In many passages indeed mortality and frailty are predicated of human nature generally without being placed in connection with sin—as when man (Gen. xviii. 27) is called dust and ashes; when, in Ps. lxxxix. 48 f., it is said: "Remember, Lord, how short my life is; to what nothingness Thou hast created all sons of men;" compare further ciii. 14 ff., and other passages. But this does not mean that death originally belonged to man's nature. These expressions are simply utterances of *the experience of the present frailty* of man; which experience, indeed, is so predominant in the Old Testament view of man, that the meaning *to be sick* or *diseased* attaches to the verbal stem אָנַשׁ, which properly means to be man [a very questionable etymology.—D.].

(1) Compare my *Commentationes* and my article "Unsterblichkeit-Lehre des A. T. von derselben," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xxi. p. 409 ff.—There is no topic of Old Testament theology on which the literature is so rich as on the one in question. Various views existed on the subject, even in the older Judaism—see Himpel, *Die Unsterblichkeitslehre des A. T.*, 1857 (Ehinger Progr.), p. 2 f.; over it the Church Fathers disputed with the heretics—see my *Commentationes*, p. 1 ff. The discussion was renewed by the Socinians and Deists—see the same, p. 4 f., and Himpel, *l. c.* p. 6 ff., where reference is also made to the various views of more modern theologians. The literature of the subject up to the year 1844 is noted in Böttcher's learned work, *De Inferis*, etc.—Besides the writings of Böttcher and Himpel, we here mention Mau, *Vom Tode, dem Solde der Sünden, und der Auferstehung Christi*, 1841; H. A. Hahn, *De spe immortalitatis sub V. T. gradatim exculta*, 1846; Fr. Beck, "Zur Würdigung der alttest. Vorstellungen von der Unsterblichkeit," in Baur's and Zeller's *Theol. Jahrbüchern*, 1851, p. 469 ff.; H. Schultz, *V. T. de hominis immortalitate sent.*, 1860, with which are to be compared the relevant sections in the same author's work, *Die Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit*, 1861.—The more modern writings on biblical anthropology and eschatology enter, also, more or less on the Old Testament doctrine of the state after death; especially Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychologie*, 2d ed., in which a list of works on this topic is given.

(2) Knobel remarks on Gen. ii. 17: "Jehovah announces a worse result than He knows will follow—as a father sometimes, in giving a prohibition to his children, threatens them with more than he really means."

(3) The passage Gen. ii. 17 was well expounded by Augustine, *De pecc. mer.* i. 21: "Quamvis annos multos postea vixerint, illo tamen die mori cœperunt, quo mortis legem, qua in senium veterascerent, acceperunt." On this passage compare also my *Commentationes*, p. 21, and Herm. Schultz, *Die Voraussetzungen*, etc., p. 121 ff.—It is indicated by the incident of clothes made from animals' skins, mentioned in Gen. iii. 21, that man at once was given to see, in the case of the beasts, what death is.

(4) Gen. vi. 3.—In בְּשַׁגַּם הוּא a change of number, as is often the case, takes place. The בְּשַׁגַּם cannot possibly be taken to mean, "because also" = גַּם בַּאֲשֶׁר. Apart from the fact that in the idiom of the Pentateuch שֶׁ for אֲשֶׁר is not found, a combination of particles of this sort would be entirely without example, besides which the "also" would be quite unnecessary. The word is rather to be understood as the infinitive of שָׁגַג, to wander, to go astray—an infinitive in A, such as is found from some intransitive roots *"ע.*

(5) So Keil: "In his erring he has shown himself to be flesh—that is, as incapacitated by his own act for being governed by God's Spirit."
(6) Jul. Müller, too, thus explains the passage (*The Doctrine of Sin*, ii. 5th ed. p. 404).

§ 78.

The Doctrine of Mosaism on the Condition after Death.

Death takes place when the divine spirit of life which sustains man is withdrawn by God, Ps. civ. 29, by which means man *expires* (this is meant by גָּוַע, see Gen. vii. 21 with 22), upon which the body returns to the dust from whence it is taken; see also passages like Job xxxiv. 14 f., Eccles. xii. 7 compared with viii. 8. It might appear from these passages that the *human being as a whole is annihilated* in death, which has been represented as Old Testament doctrine by not a few (even by H. A. Hahn) (1). Indeed, from the standpoint of mere reason, as shown in Eccles. iii. 18–21, there exists no certainty whether man is different from the animals in death. But it is clear, from the whole *connection of Old Testament doctrine* (2), that as the origin so also the final destiny of man's soul is different from that of the soul of an animal (with which it seems to be identified in Ps. civ. 29), and that, when the sustaining spirit of life is withdrawn, although the band by which the נֶפֶשׁ [soul] is bound to the body is loosed, the soul itself, and man, so far as his personality lies in the soul, continues to exist; yet, since all vital energies depend on the infusion of the רוּחַ [spirit], he exists only as a weak shadow, which wanders into the kingdom of the dead (שְׁאוֹל). The word *souls*, it is true, is never used in the Old Testament of the inhabitants of the kingdom of the dead; nor do we find the expression *spirits*, for Job iv. 15 is not a case in point (3). But that it is the נֶפֶשׁ which wanders into the kingdom of the dead is clear from passages like Ps. xvi. 10, xxx. 4, lxxxvi. 13, lxxxix. 49, xciv. 17, Prov. xxiii. 14, and Ps. xlix. 20, if there (which is, indeed, disputed by some) תָּבוֹא is in the third person, and נַפְשׁוֹ is to be supplied as the subject from the preceding verse (4). So also it is the נֶפֶשׁ which returns again to the body of the dead child on being restored to life, 1 Kings xvii. 21 f. (4). The narratives of resurrection from the dead (1 Kings xvii. 21 f.; 2 Kings iv. 34 f.) may be adduced as proving that *a closer connection between the body just quitted and the soul* still subsists immediately after death (apart from what has been remarked on the application of נֶפֶשׁ to denote a corpse, § 70) (5). Perhaps, too, this idea may be found in the difficult passage Job xiv. 22, which certainly, according to the context, refers to the state of one dead, not of one about to die, and then speaks of the dull pain experienced after separation by the soul and the body. Delitzsch understands this to mean, "that the process of the corruption of the body casts painful reflections into the departed soul;" but the passage can be also understood (and perhaps more correctly) to speak of the pain which the body and soul separately feel, as in Isa. lxvi. 24 sensation in corpses is presupposed. On the contrary, there is no trace in the Old Testament of the *Egyptian* notion that a continual connection subsists between the soul and body, in virtue of which the preservation of the body secures the continuance of the soul, although Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5, ascribes this Egyptian conception to the Jews; and there is just as little trace of the heathen idea that the soul of the departed one cannot find

rest before the burial of its dead body. Isa. xiv. 15 ff. speaks expressly against the latter view (6).

The *place* into which man migrates, the בֵּית מוֹעֵד לְכָל-חָי, Job xxx. 23, is called *Sheol* (שְׁאוֹל, seldom written defectively). The word, which is to be regarded as feminine, may, with Winer, Hengstenberg, and others, be derived from שָׁאַל, *poscere* [to ask], so that the kingdom of the dead would be characterized as that which is insatiable in its demands. Passages like Prov. i. 12, xxvii. 20, xxx. 16, Isa. v. 14, Hab. ii. 5, in which the insatiable appetite of Sheol is spoken of, are favorable to this derivation ; only it is improbable that the word, which without doubt is very old, should really have only the character of a poetical epithet. The word is traced by most modern writers to the stem שָׁעַל, to be hollow (as in German, *Höhle*, a cavern, is connected with *Hölle*, hell), a softening of the ע into א being assumed ; or they go back to the root שׁוּל, שׁל = *χάω*, *hio*, which lies at the basis of the stem שׁעל, and hence *χάσμα*, ravine, abyss, is regarded as the original meaning of the word (7).—The separate features of the descriptions of the kingdom of the dead cannot be all taken very literally, owing to the poetical character of most of the passages ; still the following *essential features of the conception of Sheol* are distinctly presented :—The kingdom of the dead (in contrast with the upper spheres of light and life, Prov. xv. 24, Ezek. xxvi. 20, etc.) is supposed to be in the depths ; compare Num. xvi. 30, and expressions like שְׁאוֹל תַּחְתִּית, Deut. xxxii. 22, Ps. lxxxvi. 13, the depths of the earth ; Ps. lxiii. 10, comp. lxxxviii. 7, the land beneath ; Ezek. xxvi. 20, xxxi. 14, xxxii. 18, deeper even than the waters and their inhabitants. It agrees with this, that it is a region of thickest *darkness*, where, as Job x. 22 says, the light is as midnight. The dead are there gathered in tribes ; and hence the oft-recurring term in the Pentateuch, "to go (בּוֹא) or be gathered (נֶאֱסַף) to his fathers (אֶל-אֲבוֹתָיו), or to his people (אֶל-עַמָּיו)" (Gen. xxv. 8 f., xxxv. 29, xlix. 33, Num. xx. 24 ff., etc. ; compare, too, the picture of Sheol in Ezek. xxxii. 17—32). These terms cannot possibly be referred to the grave (8). *The kingdom of the dead and the grave are, on the contrary, definitely distinguished.* For example, when Jacob says, in Gen. xxxvii. 35, "In sorrow I shall go down שְׁאֹלָה to my son," he cannot expect to be united with Joseph in the grave, since he believes that he was torn by beasts. It is true that expressions taken from the grave are transferred to the kingdom of the dead, *e. g.* Isa. xiv. 11, where it is said to the conqueror who has sunk into the realm of the dead, "Corruption is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee ;" indeed, in Ezek. xxxii. 22 ff., the expression *graves* is used of the place of the dead. But in both passages there can be no doubt of the distinction between the grave and Sheol, for in Isa. xiv. 18 ff. it is said, that while the king of Babylon descends to Sheol, his corpse was to be cast away unburied ; and the two poetical pictures depict a common place of rest for the various nations of the earth and their rulers. The expression, בּוֹר, *pit*, is also used in several passages for the kingdom of the dead (9).

As follows from the foregoing, the *condition* of men in the realm of death is represented as the *privation of all that belongs to life in the full sense ;* and so the realm of death is called simply אֲבַדּוֹן, that is, fall, destruction (Job xxvi. 6 ; Prov. xv. 11, xxvii. 20) ; also חֲרֵל, cessation (Isa. xxxviii. 11). Without strength, dull,

and like men in slumber, the dead rest in silence (דּוּמָה), Ps. xciv. 17, cxv. 17. Sheol is the land of forgetfulness, Ps. lxxxviii. 13 (אֶרֶץ נְשִׁיָּה, a term to be taken actively). "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything, and have no more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten. Their love, their hatred, their envy are long since perished, neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun.—There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol, whither thou goest," Eccles. ix. 5, 6, 10. Here, therefore, no praise of God and no contemplation of divine things is possible, Ps. vi. 6, cxv. 17, lxxxviii. 12, etc. (10). With all this, however, *their consciousness is not destroyed*, but is capable of being aroused from its slumber; their personal identity continues (compare such passages as Isa. xiv. 10, Ezek. xxxii. 21, 1 Sam. xxviii. 15 ff.). It is probable that the designation of the dwellers in the kingdom of the dead as רְפָאִים refers to this—a designation which occurs only in the writings which are later than the Pentateuch (Isa. xiv. 9, xxvi. 14; Job xxvi. 5; Ps. lxxxviii. 11; Prov. ii. 18, xxi. 16). The term is probably connected with רָפָה, languid (as נְכָאִים with נָכֶה), and means accordingly the languid, enervated (compare חֲלִי֫ת, Isa. xiv. 10; אִין־אֵ֫יל, Ps. lxxxviii. 5). In the Pentateuch, on the contrary, רְפָאִים has a quite different meaning, denoting in several passages a giant people of antiquity. Still, in this meaning the word can be traced to the same stem, if we suppose the primitive sense of רָפָה to be *to stretch*, which gives for the dead the meaning, "stretched out" (*in languorem projecti*), and for the giants the meaning *extended*, in the sense of *proceri* (11).—It is not possible to ascend or return from the realm of the dead, Job vii. 9, xiv. 12. No attempt is made to reconcile this with the return to life, 1 Kings xvii. 21 f., 2 Kings iv. 34 f.; the question may be solved in the way given above. The Old Testament relates only one example of the appearing of a dead person—viz. of Samuel, 1 Sam. xxviii. (12). The popular superstition in respect to conjuring the dead, דָּרַשׁ אֶל־הָאֹבוֹת, שָׁאַל אוֹב, is strictly prohibited, Lev. xix. 31, xx. 6; Deut. xviii. 11. The term אוֹב properly denotes not the conjuror himself, but the spirit which is conjured by him, and is supposed to speak in him. This is shown by the expressions in Lev. xx. 27 (where the necromancer is designated as אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה כִּי יִהְיֶה בָהֶם אוֹב), 1 Sam. xxviii. 7 (where the witch of Endor is called בַּעֲלַת אוֹב), and in ver. 8 of the same chapter (where necromancy is called divination through the Obh, קָסַם בְּאוֹב); compare, too, Isa. xxix. 4. The term אוֹב is hardly to be explained = *revenant*, *returning* (from a stem אוּב; in Arabic, aba), but it is probably the same word with the noun אוֹב, which signifies a leather *bottle* (properly, something blown up). The translation of the LXX, who always render the word by ἐγγαστρίμυθος, ventriloquist, also points to this view. Then, by means of a metonymy, the plural אֹבוֹת, leather bottles, is used to indicate the necromancers themselves (1 Sam. xxviii. 3). The absurdity of necromancy is pointed out in Isa. viii. 19 (13); in opposition to this the people are directed to the law and to the word of revelation, ver. 20 compared with Deut. xviii. 15 (14).

(1) Compare, also, Ps. cxlvi. 4.—To this are to be added expressions such as Ps. xxxix. 14: "Look away from me, that I may recover before I go hence and am no more;" Job vii. 21: "Now will I lay myself in the dust; Thou seekest me, and I am no more:" Job xiv. 10: "A man dies, and where is he?"

(2) In the conception of a realm of death which goes through the whole Old Testament, and which, as will be shown, is definitely distinguished from the grave, as well as in what is narrated of resurrections from the dead (1 Kings xvii. 21 ; 2 Kings iv. 34), and what is prophesied about the future rising of the dead, some continued existence of man after death is undoubtedly presupposed. The same book of Ecclesiastes which, xii. 7, teaches that the spirit returns to God who gave it, speaks, ix. 10, also of Sheol, "to which thou goest." That Job vii. 8, xiv. 10, speak only of man's disappearance from the earthly scene, and do not mean that he has entirely ceased to be, is shown in both chapters by the reference to sojourning in the kingdom of the dead. For the explanation of the term in Ps. xxxix. 14, compare Ps. xxxvii. 36. We may say indeed that man's existence after death is treated in the Old Testament so much as a matter of course, that the reality of it is never the subject of doubt. It is not even true of the book of Job that "a wavering between the traditional representations of a kingdom of the dead, and the consideration of the dead simply as beings which no more exist," is found here (see F. Beck, *l.c.* p. 475). The doubts with which the Israelitish spirit wrestled referred only to the *how* of existence after death : but the harder this struggle became because the mind could not free itself from the idea of Sheol, the less are we entitled to see in this idea only something outwardly derived from the popular belief.

(3) On Job iv. 15, see note 12.—The book of Wisdom, iii. 1, is the first to speak of souls of the dead ; then the New Testament, Rev. vi. 9 ; also *πνεύματα*, 1 Pet. iii. 19, Heb. xii. 23.

(4) On the other hand, indeed, the *death of the soul* is spoken of in Num. xxiii. 10, Job xxxvi. 14, which is to be explained by the well-known usage by which נֶפֶשׁ, etc., takes the place of the personal pronoun (comp. § 70).

(5) So Himpel, *l.c.*, p. 32 ; comp. also Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, p. 521.

(6) Tacitus writes, *l.c.*, of the Jews : "Corpora condere, quam cremare, e more Ægyptio ; eademque cura et de infernis persuasio."—For the rest, compare my *Commentationes*, p. 28, and Himpel, *l.c.* p. 31.

(7) See Hupfeld in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, ii. (1839) p. 462, and in his *Commentary on the Psalms*, Ps. vi. 6, note.

(8) Not only because the burial of the corpse is often especially mentioned along with it (comp. Gen. xxv. 9, xxxv. 29, l. 13, etc.), but chiefly because this formula, and also the cognate one, "to go to one's fathers" (Deut. xxxi. 16 ; 1 Kings ii. 10, xvi. 28, etc.), are used in speaking of those who were not united with their fathers in the grave, as Abraham, Aaron, Moses, David, and others. See a complete list of the passages belonging to this subject in Böttcher, § 112 ff.

(9) Thus בּוֹר appears in Isa. xiv. 14, Ezek. xxxii. 23, Ps. lxxxviii. 7 ; also the phrase יָרַד בּוֹר (Ps. xxviii. 1, xxx. 4 ; Prov. i. 12 ; Isa. xxxviii. 18 ; Ezek. xxvi. 20), which in itself might refer to the grave, is probably as a rule to be referred to Sheol (see Böttcher, *l.c.*, § 165).

(10) Though God's omnipotence reaches down to the world beneath, which is present to Him at all times unconcealed (Job xxvi. 6 ; Prov. xv. 11 ; Ps. cxxxix. 8), still there is no experience of communion with God to those resting there (Ps. lxxxviii. 6).

(11) See Ewald, *History of Israel*, i. p. 227 f.—On the contrary, there is no probability in Böttcher's view (*l.c.*, § 193 ff.), that the word primarily designates the race of giants as "hurled down," and that then, these fallen giants being regarded as *pars potior* of the inhabitants of Sheol, the name was extended to these in general.

(12) We may look upon it as decided that the narrative in 1 Sam. xxviii. is intended to be so understood (as the LXX have done in 1 Chron. x. 13 and Sir. xlvi. 20 (23)), and that it does not record a mere deception, as the older theologians interpreted it. (Besides the literature cited in Keil's *Commentary*, the essay, "Die Geschichte von der Zauberin zu Endor," in the *Zeitschr. für Protestantismus und Kirche*, 1851, xxii. p. 138 ff., deserves to be noticed.) On the con-

trary, it is not the appearing of a dead person that is spoken of in Job iv. 12–15, but of a divine revelation; in ver. 15, רוּחַ does not indicate a spirit, but the breathing by which the appearance announced itself.

(13) Isa. viii. 19: "Shall not a people seek unto its God?—the dead for the living?" Ewald's explanation of the latter clause is false—"instead of the living" (of the living God). It does not follow from Isa. viii. 19, as Diestel has said (in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xvii. p. 482), that even enlightened prophets believed in the possibility of inquiring of the dead, but rather the contrary.

(14) In this the Old and New Testaments agree. When our Lord says, in Luke xvi. 29, "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them," He speaks entirely in the spirit of the Old Testament.

§ 79.

(*Continuation.*)

In no part of the Old Testament is a *difference in the lot* of those in the realm of death distinctly spoken of. Job iii. 17–19 describes them there as all alike. Only in Isa. xiv. 15, Ezek. xxxii. 23, where the fallen conquerors are relegated to the uttermost depths (יַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר), can we find an indication of different grades in the realm of the dead—perhaps in the sense in which Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 8. 5) speaks of a ᾅδης σκοτιώτερος for self-murderers. Elsewhere, only a division into peoples and races, and not a division of the just and unjust, is spoken of. "To-morrow," says Samuel to Saul, 1 Sam. xxviii. 19, "shalt thou and thy sons be with me." The inhabitants of the kingdom of the dead "have no more reward," Eccles. ix. 5 f. In itself, the condition in Sheol, which is in the main the *most indefinite existence possible*, is neither *blessedness* (although longed for as a rest by him who is weary of life, Job iii. 13–19) *nor positive unblessedness;* for to those who are swept away in the midst of the enjoyment of life the punishment consists in being thus carried away, Num. xvi. 30 ff., Ps. lv. 16. The Mosaic retribution has its sphere entirely on this side of the grave (1). Of the *traces of belief in a heavenly life beyond the grave* which have been supposed to be found in the Pentateuch, the translation of Enoch, Gen. v. 24, can alone come into consideration. But that is not a testimony to a higher existence of the soul *after death;* for the meaning of the passage is that Enoch never died—that is, his body and soul were never separated (2). In it, as in the history of Elijah's translation (2 Kings ii.), there lies rather the declaration, that even before the coming of death's vanquisher some specially favored men were excepted from the curse of death and of the kingdom of death which hangs over man. These narratives, then, contain an indirect corroboration of the position that, according to the Old Testament, death is not unconditionally connected with human nature. On the other hand, the passage on the death of Moses, Deut. xxxiv. 5 (comp. § 31 with note 3), has no relation to this subject; and just as little is Num. xxiii. 10—"Let my soul die the death of the righteous"—a testimony to a belief in eternal life (for which the passage was formerly often taken). The meaning of these words is rather that Balaam wished he might be allowed to die after a life so richly blessed, as was the case with the righteous in Israel.

But it is clearly expressed in the Pentateuch that *the relation of the righteous to God is not cancelled after death.* The blood of the murdered Abel cries to God,

Gen. iv. 10. The relation into which God entered with the patriarchs continues; for, long after the patriarchs had fallen asleep, He calls Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; Ex. iii. 6 compared with Gen. xxvi. 24, xxviii. 13. "But God is not a God of the dead, but of the living" (Matt. xxii. 32). To him who has an eternal value for God an eternal existence is assured (3).

(1) Compare the account of the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, § 89 f.

(2) In speaking of Enoch, the word "dying" is not used, Gen. v. 24, but it is said that God took him away (לָקַח) because he walked with Him.

(3) On the other presuppositions of the doctrine of the resurrection and of eternal life contained in Mosaism, see further on. The doctrine of the resurrection forms a doctrine of prophetic theology: and the foreboding wrestling of Israel's sages with the enigmas of death and the realm of the dead is discussed in the third part of the *Old Testament Theology*.

THIRD DIVISION.

THE COVENANT OF GOD WITH ISRAEL AND THE THEOCRACY.

FIRST CHAPTER.

THE NATURE OF THE COVENANT.

§ 80.

Preliminary Remarks and General Survey.

THE form in which the covenant of God with Israel is made, Ex. xix.–xxiv., is a *contract* resting on the promises and *engagements* of the two contracting parties (see xix. 5, 8, xxiv. 3, 7; comp. Josh. xxiv. 15 ff.). Yet *the relation of the parties is not purely mutual* (1). In the first place, the theocratic covenant of law rests on the covenant of promise; in both, even in the covenant of the law, the *initiative* (the setting up of the covenant, הֵקִים, Gen. ix. 9, xvii. 7, etc.) comes from God as an act of grace: "I am Jehovah, thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt," Ex. xx. 2; "I have brought you to me," xix. 4, etc. Accordingly, it is Jehovah alone who fixes the *conditions* of the covenant ("I am holy, be ye also holy," Lev. xi. 44 f.), and on whom depend the *maintenance* of the regulations of the treaty and the final *realization* of the aim of the covenant. Thus the covenant is primarily *διαθήκη*, a divine institution (2), and only on this foundation is it *συνθήκη*, a treaty. How כָּרַת בְּרִית is used, even where God alone pledges Himself, is shown especially by Ex. xxxiv. 10. In the usage of the Pentateuch, the expression כָּרַת בְּרִית with עִם or אֵת [*with*] is used throughout to signify the closing of God's covenant with Israel. On the contrary, in the later books a peculiar usage appears, and a distinction is made between כָּרַת בְּרִית, in connection with לְ [*to*], and in connection with עִם or אֵת (3). The first expresses the idea that in closing a covenant, the covenant *is laid* by the one party *on* the other; compare Isa. lv. 3, lxi. 8; Jer. xxxii. 40; Ezek. xxxiv. 25 (4). In the *patriarchal covenant of promise*, the first element, that of *διαθήκη*, institution, naturally appears more prominently. The *constituting of the covenant* in Gen. xv. is a pure act of divine promise. In the vision, when deep sleep and great darkness had fallen on him, Abraham sees (ver. 12) a flame of fire pass between the parts of the divided animals. The meaning of the occurrence is not, as has been supposed from Jer. xxxiv. 18 f., that it shall be done to him who breaks the covenant as has been done to these divided animals (comp. Judg. xix. 29; 1 Sam. xi. 7), as similar customs occur in

Greek and Roman antiquity at the making of covenants (Livy, i. 24; Plutarch, *Quæst. Rom.* cap. iii.; Homer, *Iliad*, iii. 298 ff.) (5). This meaning of such covenant observances (as is plain in Jer. xxxiv.) is to be looked upon as only secondary. The original meaning is, that the two halves denote the two contracting parties, and the flame passing through denotes their union by Jehovah, who alone is He who constitutes the covenant. On the contrary, the act in Ex. xxiv., in which the *theocratic covenant* is made, refers to both parties (6).

According to its nature, the covenant presents itself under the following heads:

1. The divine act, from which the covenant proceeds, viz. *the divine election*, and the promise annexed to it.

2. *Man's obligation.* He again who prescribes the obligation is *God;* that to which man is bound, is the revelation of the divine will in *the law*, especially the *Decalogue*, which is the obligatory document in the stricter sense; but the symbol of obligation is in particular the sign of *circumcision*, imposed on those who are subject to the covenant obligations.

3. Thus, according as the nation performs its obligation, the divine *retribution* is determined, which, however, is so carried out that at the end the divine purpose of election must come to be realized.

(1) As, for example, the matter has been quite wrongly taken up by Spencer, *De leg. Hebr. Rit.*, ed. Tubing., p. 234, and especially p. 236, etc.

(2) On the other hand, any relation instituted by God between Himself and man (like the promise of grace given to David, Ps. lxxxix. 4), and indeed any regulation and limit laid by Him on the creature (comp. passages like Jer. xxxiii. 20, Hos. ii. 20, Zech. xi. 10, etc.), in particular every theocratic ordinance (as the institution of the Sabbath, Ex. xxxi. 16), may be characterized as בְּרִית.

(3) See, *e.g.*, Jer. xxxi. 31, 33. Comp. Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, ii. p. 718.

(4) The Pentateuch uses כָּרַת בְּרִית with לְ only in speaking of the covenants of Israel with Canaan and its idols.

(5) *Iliad*, iii. 298 ff.:

> "All-glorious Jove, and ye, the powers of heaven,
> Whoso shall violate this contract first,
> So be the brains of them and of their sons
> Poured out, as we this wine pour on the earth."
> (*Cowper's translation.*)

(6) See the doctrine of sacrifice, § 121.

FIRST DOCTRINE.

THE DIVINE ELECTION.

§ 81.

Israel's Election as the Free Act of God's Love. בָּחַר *and* יָדַע.

The adoption of Israel as the covenant people is a free act of God, or in other words, *an act of divine love, and necessary only so far as God has bound Himself by His oath*,—that is, as a proof of His truth and his faithfulness,—but is in no way dependent on man's desert.

These propositions are expressed in the entire historical guidance of the people of revelation from Abraham's calling onward (1), but they are expressly incul-

cated on the people at every opportunity. The God to whom the earth belongs will have Israel for His own property, Ex. xix. 5. It is only on the ground of the gracious election and guidance of God that the divine commands to the people are given, and therefore the Decalogue, Ex. xx. 2, places at its forefront the fact of election (2). In *Deuteronomy* especially this point forms one of the fundamental thoughts. The following are the main passages :—vii. 7 f., "Jehovah has not set His love upon you and chosen you because ye are more than all nations, for ye are the least of all nations ; but because Jehovah has *loved* you, and that He might keep the oath which He has sworn to your fathers." The divine *love* appears here as the first point in the founding of the covenant relation with Israel. Compare further viii. 17 : the people are not to say, "My might and the strength of my hand has procured me such power. Think on Jehovah thy God, that He has given thee strength to do valiantly, that He may keep His covenant ;" also ix. 4–6 : the people of Israel shall not say in their hearts that because of their own righteousness God has driven out the nations of Canaan ; that was done partly because of the godlessness of the Canaanites, and partly to fulfill the promises given to the fathers ; "for thou art a stiffnecked people."

The divine promise is sealed by *the oath of God*, which is given whenever the matter in question is an unchangeable decree, the performance of which is not to depend on contingencies (Heb. vi. 17) (3).

Besides the term בָּחַר [to choose], in which the freedom of God's gracious purpose stands out most strongly, the word יָדַע, *to know*, is used to characterize the divine decree of election ; thus, first, Gen. xviii. 19, also Amos iii. 2, Hos. xiii. 5 (4). All knowing is an appropriation, by which the strangeness between the perceiving subject and the object is removed. Thus ידע has in various senses a more pregnant meaning than that of mere theoretical knowledge ; it includes the exercise of the heart's sympathy in taking in an object, and so means to take knowledge of anything with love, care, and the like—to care for one ; compare Prov. xxvii. 23, where it stands parallel with שִׁית לֵב (to direct the heart, the attention, to anything), and thus forms the opposite of מָאַס, to reject (see *e.g.* Job ix. 21). It stands thus for the divine care for the righteous, Ps. i. 6, xxxvii. 18, etc. ; thus, Ex. xxxiii. 12, the words "I know thee by name" express the inward relation of personal appropriation in which Moses stands to Jehovah (corresponding to the words, "Thou hast found grace in mine eyes"). But as יָדַע is said of God not simply in reference to the relation in which He already stands to man, but also in reference to His placing man in a relation to Him in virtue of which he acknowledges himself as His property, יָדַע becomes another name for the divine election (synonymous with בָּחַר) (5).

(1) Compare the historical section, § 22 ff.

(2) Ex. xx. 2 : "I, Jehovah, am thy God, who hath brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

(3) In Heb. vi. 17 the divine oath attests τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ. Compare Achelis' excellent paper, "Ueber den Schwur Gottes bei sich selbst," in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1867. The reader may see from that essay how well worth while it is to follow up such special points in Holy Scripture. There are promises and threats which are uttered conditionally, for which the main passage is Jer. xviii. 7–10. The promise which is uttered conditionally to

Abraham in Gen. xii. is made unconditional by the oath of God in chap. xxii., when Abraham is proved.

(4) On Gen. xviii. 19, comp. § 23 with note 6.—Am. iii. 2, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth."—This pregnant designation of the divine knowledge appears frequently in the New Testament γιγνώσκειν.

(5) The earlier theologians expressed this briefly thus: ידע does not mean merely *nosse cum affectu.* but also *cum effectu.*

§ 82.

Forms in which the Election of the People is expressed.

The divine election of the people is expressed in the following forms:—Jehovah is the Father of His people; Israel His first-born son; His property out of all the nations of the earth; the holy, priestly people. All these ideas are correlated.

1. In the Old Testament, the meaning of the divine *fatherhood* is not physical, as if God were called the Father of men because He gives them natural life and preserves them in it, but *ethical.* It denotes the relation of love and moral communion in which Jehovah has placed Israel to Himself. This relation is quite unique; Jehovah is *only the Father of the chosen people*, not the Father of the other nations. When Jehovah, in Ex. iv. 22 f., bids Moses say to Pharaoh: "Israel is my son, even my first-born; and I say unto thee, Let my son go that he may serve me," we may in the expression "first-born son" find an indication that at some time other nations also are to enter into this sonship; but the term is primarily to be explained by the contrast with Pharaoh's first-born—Israel is the same to Jehovah as Pharaoh's first-born son is to him. So also is Deut. xxxii. 6, the second main passage in the Pentateuch, to be explained: "Do ye thus requite Jehovah, O foolish people and unwise? is not He thy Father that hath created thee? hath He not made thee and established thee?" The words כֹּנֵן, עָשָׂה, קָנָה, do not here indicate the creation of the people in the same sense that all men are made by God, but signify those divine acts by which Israel is established and prepared as the people of God's possession and covenant, and so simply denote its election. In this sense, in Isa. xliii. 1, 15, xlv. 11, Jehovah is called Israel's creator and former; and when it is said, in lxiv. 7, "But now, O Jehovah, Thou art our Father; we are the clay, and Thou the potter; and we all are the work of Thy hand," the meaning is, that Israel owes to the gracious power of its God all that it is and has; comp. Ps. c. 3 (1).—The fatherhood of Jehovah was *displayed* in the deliverance of the people from Egypt, Hos. xi. 1; then in the divine guidance through the wilderness, which was a fatherly discipline, Deut. viii. 5, compare Hos. xi. 3; and so likewise all subsequent redemption and providential guidance of Israel is a manifestation of the divine fatherhood (see Isa. lxiii. 16) (2); Jeremiah xxxi. 9 declares that when the ten rejected tribes return with weeping, and Jehovah leads them, He says, "For I am a father to Israel" (compare ver. 20, "Is Ephraim my dear son?"). Also in Mal. ii. 10, compared with i. 6, the idea of the divine fatherhood is to be understood in the same way. The prophet denounces the marriages which the people contracted with heathen women after repudiating their Israelitish spouses. When it is said in this connection, "Have we not all

one *father?* has not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?" the heathen cannot possibly be included along with Israel, and the בָּרָאנוּ is to be understood, as in the above-cited passages, of the creation and preparation of Israel to be the covenant people.—As Israel as a whole is called *God's son*, so the name is also transferred to the *members of the nation*, Deut. xiv. 1: "Ye are sons of Jehovah, your God." Still this name is not to be understood as if *every citizen* of the theocracy could apply to himself individually the God-sonship. It is only the *body of the covenant people* that have the name "sons of God," and the Israelite has a share in the God-sonship only in virtue of being incorporated into this body. The individual personal sonship of God did not appear till later in the theocratic kingdom (2).

2. The same relation between Israel and God which rests on the divine election is expressed in the appellations—*people of God's possession*, *a holy people*. Thus, after the words of Deut. xiv. just quoted,—"Ye are sons of Jehovah your God,"—ver. 2 follows—"Thou art an *holy* people to Jehovah thy God, and Jehovah hath *chosen* thee to be a *peculiar people* (עַם סְגֻלָּה = a people of *property*) unto Himself, above all the nations that are on the earth;" comp. vii. 6, and for the סְגֻלָּה, Ex. xix. 5, Ps. cxxxv. 4 (3). In Deut. iv. 20, עַם נַחֲלָה stands for it, which specially teaches that God obtained this people for Himself by a special act (comp. § 83). The phrase *holy* people (as is mentioned in § 44) conveys negatively the idea of separation from all other people, and positively of admission or introduction into communion with God; as is said in Ex. xix. 4, "I have brought you to myself" (comp. Lev. xx. 24, 26). In virtue of this attitude to God, Israel is a *priestly* people: xix. 6, "Ye shall be unto me מַמְלֶכֶת כֹּהֲנִים" [A. V. a kingdom of priests]. The expression מַמְלָכָה may denote *kinghood* (this is the more common meaning) and *kingdom*. If we take the first meaning, and translate "Ye shall be a priestly kinghood to me" (the translation of the LXX takes it thus—*βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα*,) both the priestly and the kingly dignity of the people are expressed, and both predicated of God's people on the ground of this passage (1 Pet. ii. 9; Rev. i. 6, v. 10). Thus Keil, against which we need only remark that the Old Testament assigns a position of dominion in the world to the people of God as such, but still never uses the term "royal *people*." On the second and more general explanation, Israel is a priestly kingdom—that is, a community of priests under King Jehovah. *Vocation to the immediate service of the true God* is the main idea in the priestly character of the covenant people. Israel's *mediatorial position* toward the other nations may also, perhaps, be indicated; but this is not followed out any further in the Pentateuch, which only emphasizes the *separation* of Israel from all the other nations of the earth. This separation is, in the first instance, effected in an external manner. Israel is "the people that dwells alone" (לָבָד יִשְׁכֹּן), and is not reckoned among the nations of the world (Num. xxiii. 9; Deut. xxxiii. 28). Further, all unclean persons, eunuchs, those begotten in incest (the latter is probably the meaning of the difficult word מַמְזֵר), Deut. xxiii. 2 f., are excluded from the congregation; and those who have defiled themselves for a time must also withdraw themselves during this period from intercourse with the people. God sanctifies the people to Himself *positively* by dwelling among them, by His revelation in word and deed, by every institution on which is imprinted the unique

relation between Israel and God, and finally, by placing His Spirit in the congregation. Still, in all this it is only an *objective relation* which is established: every Israelite has a share in this holiness in virtue of natural birth, and in virtue of the outward connection of his life with the holy congregation,—not in virtue of the new birth of the Spirit and the communion of a spiritual life with God; for Jehovah's Spirit (which is placed in the congregation, comp. Isa. lxiii. 11) rests only on the leading organs of the theocracy, not on all its members, Num. xi. 16 ff. (comp. § 65). Nevertheless, a distinction, within the theocratic union, between Israel according to the flesh, and the covenant people who are really seeking after the true God (Ps. xxiv. 6), the race of God's children (lxxiii. 15), occurs in the Old Testament, as will be shown more particularly afterward. Hence the names "holy people," "priestly kingdom," "God's peculiar people," are names which are full of the future, prophetic types of that which is to come, since the ransomed Israel of the future shall be called "sons of the living God" in the full significance of the word (בְּנֵי אֵל־חַי), Hos. ii. 1 (4).

3. The *other nations*, as גּוֹיִם (which is a purely quantitative idea), form a great profane mass. The uniqueness of the covenant people in distinction from the heathen corresponds to Jehovah's uniqueness as the true God in contrast to the heathen gods as nothings (§ 43 f.). Thus the contrast between Israel and the גּוֹיִם has a signification quite different from that betwixt Greeks and barbarians (with which it has sometimes been compared) (5), and makes Israel the object of the fiercest hatred to other nations. Still, even from the standpoint of Mosaism, the *theocratic exclusiveness is not absolutely exclusive;* for, aside from the fact that the people, at the time when they came up out of Egypt, included non-Israelitish elements (Ex. xii. 38, comp. with Lev. xxiv. 10, Num. xi. 4), every heathen, dwelling as a stranger in the land, could by circumcision become incorporated among the covenant people, and thus receive a share of all the gracious benefits bestowed on Israel, Ex. xii. 48; with the exception, however, of the *Canaanitish tribes*, which fell under the curse. To these the *Moabites* and *Ammonites* (Deut. xxiii. 4 ff.) were added as excluded persons. But with regard to the *Edomites* and *Egyptians*, it was ordained that their naturalization, in virtue of which they should come to be regarded as equal to the Israelites born in the land, was not to take place till the third generation, ver. 8 f.; that is, that the great-grandchildren of Edomites and Egyptians who had lived in Israel as strangers were the first who might be incorporated with God's people through circumcision. In particular, heathen slaves were to be incorporated into the family by circumcision, Ex. xii. 44. From Gen. xvii. 12, compared with ver. 23, where Abraham was compelled to circumcise all his servants, those born in the house and those bought from strangers, it follows that this passage is not to be understood as merely *allowing* slaves to be circumcised, but as actually *commanding* this.

(1) [L. Schulze, in his review of the first edition of this work in the *Allgem. literar. Anzeiger*, 1874, criticises the omission of the thought of a general fatherhood of God grounded in the creation, as constituting the presupposition for the special fatherhood of God for Israel—a thought implied in Is. lxiv. 7 [A. V. 8] comp. with xlv. 9, 12, and lying also in Jer. iii. 19. That the Creator is a father—the comparison is quite obvious—is often intended, we may admit; but the fatherhood of God in respect to Israel expresses his special relation to Israel,

and Jer. 3, 19 is most naturally translated, "how shall I put thee among the children," *i.e.* regard and treat thee as a son (so Graf. *s. l.*) but not as Schultz, "portion thee among the children," or as Keil, "make thee to stand among the sons."]

(2) Hos. xi. 1 : "When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called my son out of Egypt."—Deut. viii. 5 : "As a man chasteneth his son, so Jehovah thy God chasteneth thee."—Isa. lxiii. 16 : "Doubtless Thou art our Father, Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledges us not : Thou, Jehovah, art our Father ; our Redeemer is Thy name from everlasting."

(3) In the סְגֻלָּה lies the idea of precious property, which one has selected for himself, which one has set aside ; LXX : *λαὸς περιούσιος.*

(4) In this signification, the New Testament applies these names to the Christian church.

(5) It was even acknowledged by the heathen that the people of Israel *μόνους ἁπάντων ἐθνῶν ἀκοινωνήτους εἶναι τῆς πρὸς ἄλλο ἔθνος ἐπιμιξίας.* Diodor. Sic. *Eklog.* xxxiv.

SECOND DOCTRINE.

MAN'S OBLIGATION.

§ 83.

The Servant of Jehovah.

The *covenant of promise* with Abraham was made upon the condition that he and his descendants bind themselves to a godly life and to obedience to God's will, Gen. xvii. 1 f., xviii. 19 (1). The *same condition* is prescribed to the people, Ex. xix. 5, and accepted by the people, ver. 8 ; comp. xxiv. 3 (2). Laid under this obligation to their God, the Israelites are the *servants* of Jehovah, whom He has purchased by redeeming them from Egyptian bondage, and who, therefore, are exempt from all earthly lordship by being bound to the service of God, Lev. xxv. 42, 55, xxvi. 13 (3). Thus "servants of God" is a designation of Israel, especially in the liturgical psalms (Ps. cxiii. 1, etc.). But the idea of the servant of God is complete only when he who is bound to God also binds himself to God's will, following God perfectly,—the praise which is repeatedly given to Caleb and Joshua as servants of God, Num. xiv. 24 (וַיְמַלֵּא אַחֲרָי), xxxii. 12 (מִלְאוּ אַחֲרַי יהוה), Josh. xiv. 8 f. Thus to the servant of God belongs the subjective quality of *righteousness* (צְדָקָה). This word expresses in general *the conformity of man to God's will,—his normal relation to God.* Inasmuch as God's will is *elective* and *promissory*, צְדָקָה consists in full surrender to elective grace and the divine word of promise. Thus it is the righteousness of faith ; and in this sense it is said of *Abraham*, Gen. xv. 6, "He believed in Jehovah, and it was imputed to him as righteousness" (4). So far as the will of God is a *commanding* will, צְדָקָה lies in the fulfilling of God's commands, Deut. vi. 25, וּצְדָקָה תִּהְיֶה לָּנוּ כִּי־נִשְׁמֹר לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת לִפְנֵי יהוה. Inasmuch also, as the name "servant of God" specially designates *the chosen instruments of the divine kingdom*, an essential element in the idea is the subjunctive factor of *faithfulness in the house of God ;* and in this signification, "servant of the Lord" is the highest name of honor in the old covenant,—applied to Abraham, Gen. xxvi. 24 ; Moses, Num. xii. 7, Josh. i. 2–7. עֶבֶד יְהוָה is different from מְשָׁרֵת, which denotes minister or at-

tendant in general without regard to his personal quality; on which account the word שָׁרַת is most frequently used of priestly and Levitical service (5).

(1) Gen. xvii. 1: "Walk before me and be perfect (תָּמִים), so will I set my covenant between me and thee."—xviii. 19; comp. § 23, with note 6.
(2) Ex. xix. 5: "If ye hearken to my voice and keep my covenant," etc.—xxiv. 3: "All the words which Jehovah hath spoken will we do."
(3) Not under a human yoke—*upright*, [*erect*] קוֹמְמִיּוּת—are the Israelites led by God, according to Lev. xxvi. 13; comp. § 109.
(4) More on the righteousness of faith in the Old Testament in the part on prophecy (§ 223).
(5) The passage 1 Kings x. 5, concerning Solomon's court, is, I think, misunderstood by Roediger in *Gesenius' Thesaurus*, when he there takes מְשָׁרְתִים to be higher officials. מְשָׁרְתִים in this passage rather signifies the attendants, and מְנַשְּׂאִים the higher officials.

§ 84.

The Law.

The compass of the people's obligations, the revelation of God's commanding will, is *the law* (תּוֹרָה), the *fundamental principle* of which is expressed in the words, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," Lev. xi. 44 f., xix. 2; or more completely, xx. 7, "Sanctify yourselves and be holy, for I am Jehovah your God."—The impress of consecration to the holy God is to be stamped on the life of the Israelites in ordinances extending to all important relations and conditions: in every important affair of life the Israelite has to accomplish something which God demands. Therefore in all things he must realize to himself the voice of the commanding God. Hence, according to the ordinances in Num. xv. 38 f., Deut. xxii. 12, he wears tassels on the skirts of his garments, to remind him every moment to think on all Jehovah's commands, and not to be guided by the imaginations of his heart and the lust of his eyes. Here there is no primary distinction between *the inner and the outer life;* the holy calling of the people must be realized in both. The traditional division of the law of Moses into *moral*, *ceremonial*, and *juristic laws* may serve to facilitate a general view of theocratic ordinances: but it is incorrect if it seeks to express a distinction within the law, and to claim a difference of dignity for the various parts. For in the law, the most inward commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," stands beside "Thou shalt not sow thy field with two kinds of seed," Lev. xix. 18, 19. That Israel must be holy, like God, is the ground alike of the command not to be defiled by eating the flesh of certain animals, xi. 44 ff., and of the command to honor father and mother, xix. 2 f. In fact, the ceremonial law gives special expression to the antagonism of the true religion to heathen nature-worship, by showing that while in the latter the Deity is drawn down into nature, in the former what is natural must be consecrated and hallowed to God. The whole law, in all its parts, has the same *form* of absolute, unconditional command. Before the making of the covenant, the people had the choice whether they would bind themselves by the law that was to be given; but after they pledge themselves, all choice is taken away. Because of this strictly objective character of the law, human judgment cannot be allowed to make distinctions between the different precepts. Whether such

distinctions are to be made can be decided only by the Lawgiver, who appoints, it is true, a severer punishment for certain moral abominations, and for the transgression of such precepts as stand in immediate relation to the covenent idea (*e.g.* circumcision, the Sabbath, etc.) than for other transgressions. But, so far as man is concerned, the most inconsiderable precept is viewed under the aspect of the obedience demanded for the whole law: "Cursed is he that fulfils not the words of this law to do them," Deut. xxvii. 26.

In these points lies what has been called the *unfreedom* and *externality* of the Mosaic law, a thing which has often been incorrectly assumed. For it is not true that the law of Moses demands only external conformity to the law,—only the *opus operatum*, not a frame of mind; that, in short, it demands *legality*, not *morality*. On the contrary, the law insists on the *disposition of the heart* when it says, Ex. xx. 17, "Thou shalt not covet" (1); when it binds men to love God with the whole heart and soul, to be placable toward their fellow-men, and the like, Deut. vi. 5, Lev. xix. 17 f.; when it demands the circumcision of the heart—that is, the purification and devotion of it to God, Deut. x. 16 (cf. also Josh. xxii. 5, xxiii. 11). But undoubtedly, as has been remarked, it demands the external as co-ordinate with the internal. And precisely in this lies an important educating element. When all the relations of life, even those merely external, are placed under a direct command of God—when man in all he does or may not do has to render obedience to God, he is thereby led to the truth that what he ought to be is not to be sought in rules of life arbitrarily formed and shaped by conventionality, but in an absolutely perfect will, which conditions and determines all things. The revealed law, it is true, here undertakes the functions of *conscience;* and it is characteristic of the law of Moses, that for the present there is no reference made to the *νόμος γραπτὸς ἐν καρδίαις*. But this binding of the servant of God to an absolute will standing above nature, this obligation to give up self-will and natural desires, and all that may seem good or pleasant to the individual judgment (2), is, as Rosenkranz (3) rightly says, an apparent regress in comparison with the free play of fancy in heathenism, but a real and decided step in advance toward the liberation of man. By bringing man to a consciousness of the essential nature of a higher divine righteousness, the law roused the conscience from its slumber, taught men to recognize wickedness as sin, and so made the need of reconciliation with God to be felt.

For a right estimate of the law of Moses, the following points have further to be noticed:—1. The *whole ritual ordinances* to which the Israelite is subject, from his circumcision onward, *have a symbolic character*, mirroring the inner process of sanctification, and so forming the instrument of a tuition advancing from the outer to the inner (4) The prophets and the Psalms, when they speak of the true sacrifice, the true lustration which man needs, are simply expressing the thoughts that underlie the symbolical ritual. 2. *The precepts of the law are given in detail mainly on the negative side;* what the Israelite may *not* do is told with great particularity. The scholastic subtlety of the Rabbins, indeed, has made out the considerable number of 248 positive commands, against 365 prohibitions (5). But it is easy to see that with regard to positive duties the law often states only general rules; that, in fact, many positive points that lie in its intention are not expressly enjoined, but that only the facts, patterns, and institutions are set

forth which serve to guide a free development of positive virtues (6). It was only Jewish *tradition* which at a later period extended its leading-strings over the space which the law had left open for the free development of piety. 3. Finally, —and this is the main point,—we have to look at the *motives* for fulfilling the law which the law presents. All righteousness required by the law presupposes faith in the divine election, gracious guidance, and promise. The legislation opens with the words, Ex. xix. 4, "Ye have seen how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you to myself;" and so the *Decalogue* puts at the head of its demands (xx. 2) what God has done for Israel. But it is *Deuteronomy* in particular, as we have already shown (§ 31, 81), which, by showing how God has loved His people, seeks to excite responsive love as the deepest motive for obedience, and especially to make the law acceptable to the people by awaking a sense of its excellency and fitness, Deut. iv. 6–8, xxx. 11–14 (7); though, at the same time, Deuteronomy leaves no doubt that the people neither can nor will attain such willingness to obey (cf. v. 26, xxxi. 16 ff., xxxii.).

(1) More concerning Ex. xx. 17 in § 86.

(2) The Israelite, as Herder laments, "can never raise himself to an ideal that demands freer activity and truer delight in life."

(3) *Die Pädagogik als System*, 1848, p. 190.

(4) See also § 95 on the priesthood, § 112 and note 2 on the Mosaic worship, § 135 on the Nazirate, etc.

(5) The Rabbins associate these numbers with the 365 days of the year and the 248 members of the human body, according to the physiology of the time; cf. Maimonides' scheme of the precepts, in Jost's *History of Judaism*, 1857, 1 Abth. p. 451 ff.

(6) See further, *e.g.*, the sections on prayer, the Sabbath, etc. In this point especially the wise tuition of the Mosaic law is seen.

(7) Ex. xx. 2, see § 81 and note 2.—Deut. iv. 6–8: "The law shall be your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the nations, which, hearing all these statutes, shall say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people; what great nation is there that has statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?" (cf. Ps. cxlvii. 19 f.) —This boast has been justified by the spiritual dominion which the institutions of Israel have exercised over the nations.—Deut. xxx. 11–14: "This commandment which I command thee this day is not incomprehensible to thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, so that thou must say, Who shall go up for us to heaven and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea . . . but the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart to do it."

§ 85.

The Decalogue. Its Division.

The portion of the covenant *which relates to man's duty*, compendiously expressed, is the *book of the covenant* (comp. Ex. xxiv. 7), which embraces Ex. xx. 1–17), and chap. xxi.–xxiii; and in this, again, especially the Decalogue (1) which stands at the beginning, xx. 2–17,—*the ten words* (as it is often called; see Ex. xxxiv. 28, Deut. iv. 13, x. 4) (2), which are specifically distinguished as spoken by Jehovah Himself, while the rest of the legislation is proclaimed by Moses (3). The Decalogue, therefore, is called κ. ἐξ. the *covenant* which God enjoined on Israel. It was written on two tables of stone, which, according to Ex. xxxii. 15, were in-

scribed on both sides. Since in these ten words God's witness to His people was concentrated, they were to be preserved in the centre of the sanctuary, in the ark (4).

The *number ten* characterizes the commandments as a complete whole, and similar series of ten are found more than once in the middle books of the Pentateuch (5).—The Decalogue is again given in Deut. v. 6 ff. The two editions are distinguished—not to speak of less important variations (6)—*first*, by different reasons being annexed to the Sabbath-law (in Exodus the Sabbath of creation is assigned, while in Deuteronomy, agreeably to the predominantly subjective ground of the law in this book, Egyptian slavery and the deliverance therefrom are alluded to) ; *secondly*, by the addition in Deuteronomy, in the command against coveting, putting the *wife* instead of the *house* first and apart, and emphasizing this separation by a change of verb (7).

On the *division of the Decalogue* there have long been various views. The *main schemes of division are three*, distinguished by the way in which they take the first and last commandment. The *first* scheme became prevalent in the Roman Catholic Church under the influence of *Augustine*, and has been retained by the Lutherans, and in recent times has been defended by Otto, Kurtz, and others. It includes in the first commandment Ex. xx. 2–6, Deut. v. 6–10 (8). The ninth commandment is generally taken according to the text of Exodus, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *house ;*" the tenth, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *wife*," etc. Augustine himself, on the contrary, in the main passage in which he treats of this subject (*Quæst. in Exod.* 71), holds to the text of Deuteronomy for the ninth and tenth commandments. He is followed among the moderns by Sonntag and Kurtz, who emend the text of Exodus by the aid of Deuteronomy. Thus the ninth commandment would refer to the coveting of the conjugal rights ; the tenth, to the coveting of the possessions of a neighbour.—The *second* and *third* schemes of division agree in making the whole prohibition of concupiscence a single commandment (the tenth), but they differ as to the first and second commandment. According to the view now common among the Jews,—which, however, seems to rest on no very ancient tradition,—the first of the ten words comprises only Ex. xx. 2 : "I am the Lord thy God, who hath brought thee out," etc. This, they say, implies the obligation to believe on God as the most perfect being. The second commandment (vers. 3–6) then includes the obligation to believe on God's unity and the prohibition of false worship (9). The *third* scheme, accepted by the Greek and Reformed Churches, and by the Socinians, makes ver. 3 the first commandment : "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me ;" and ver. 4 the second : "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," etc.

The third of these divisions has in its favor the oldest historical testimonies, being found not only in *Josephus* (*Ant.* iii. 5. 5), but also in *Philo* (*Quis rerum div. hæres sit*, § 35, ed. Mang. i. p. 496, and *De Decal.* § 12, Mang. ii. p. 188). Of the Fathers, *Origen* takes the same view (10). He seems to have been also acquainted with the view which included vers. 2–6 in the first commandment, but not with the division of the prohibition of concupiscence into two (11) ; and, in fact, Augustine's view, that vers. 2–6 are a *single* commandment, must also rest on ancient Jewish tradition. The Hebrew accentuation of the Decalogue is twofold, —the one accentuation giving the usual Masoretic division into verses, the other

regulating the intonation in the synagogue. The latter takes vers. 2–6 together, showing that these five verses were viewed as closely connected. It is even more important that the Romish and Lutheran division is that on which the division of the Decalogue into *parashas* is based (12): the *sethuma*, that divides the prohibition of concupiscence, is indeed lacking in the oldest manuscripts (13), but it is certain that vers. 2–6 formed only one *parasha*. The small *parashas* are so old that this cannot be due to Christian influence.—Since, then, the union of vers. 3 and 4 as a single precept must be very old, our *decision* between the various divisions must proceed on *internal* grounds.—Now, first, it is decidedly against the Jewish view that ver. 2 is the first of the ten words, that the second verse has not in the least the form of a precept. The view which has sometimes been taken (see note 9), that this verse forms the first of the ten words as the covenant promise, is also improbable; and if vers. 2 and 3 are separated, we lose the close connection which obviously subsists between them. The words in ver. 2 have a double import. They apply, in the first place, to the whole Decalogue (comp. the opening formula, Lev. xviii. 2, xix. 2); thus they contain the general presupposition of the law, the ground of obligation for Israel, which lies in the nature of his God and the fact of his redemption. But, in the second place, they are the special ground of the command not to worship other gods besides Jehovah (14).—Further, as to vers. 3–6, the circumstance that these verses are at least closely connected seems favorable to the view that they form a single commandment, according to the Augustinian view, viz., the prohibition of idolatry; for the threat and promise of ver. 5 f. clearly refer to ver. 3 as well as to ver. 4. But if vers. 3–6 are taken as one commandment, the number ten can be reached only by dividing the prohibition of concupiscence in ver. 17 into two commandments; and since this division cannot be sufficiently justified, it remains more probable that vers. 3–6 are to be divided. They contain, in fact, two essentially distinct points. The command in ver. 3 to worship Jehovah alone does not preclude His being worshipped by an image. This is forbidden in ver. 4, which does not simply (15) add to ver. 3 the statement that the *other* gods, whose worship is forbidden in ver. 3, include idols, but especially forbids an image to be made (16) (comp. Deut. iv. 15).—Only on the Deuteronomic edition can a division of the prohibition of concupiscence be justified (for in it we might distinguish *cupiditas impura voluptatis* from *cupiditas inordinati lucri*). But the text of Exodus is certainly to be taken as primary, and it offers no essential difference in the concupiscence forbidden in the two sentences (17). Accordingly, Mark x. 19, Rom. xiii. 9 treat this as a single command: and even Luther in his catechism found it advisable to unite the ninth and tenth commandments in his explanation of them (18).

(1) In the Greek Fathers generally, ἡ δεκάλογος *sc.* βίβλος, or νομοθεσία (see *Suiceri Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, s.v.). In Latin idiom, on the contrary, *decalogus sc. liber*.

(2) LXX: οἱ δέκα λόγοι, τὰ δέκα ῥήματα.

(3) On this see Philo, *De Decal.* § 5, ed. Mang. ii. p. 183.

(4) Of the very copious literature on the Decalogue the following notice may suffice:—The recent discussions on the Decalogue, and especially its division, were opened by several essays in Ullmann and Umbreit's *Studien* by Sonntag, 1836, No. 1, 1837, No. 2; by Züllig, *ibid.* No. 1. Then appeared a lengthy and still

valuable essay by Geffcken, *Ueber die verschiedene Eintheilung des Dekalogus und den Einfluss derselben auf den Kultus*, Hamb. 1838. Compare also my article "Dekalog" in Herzog's *R.E.* iii. p. 319 ff. But since that time a more extensive literature has arisen, from which I mention: Kurtz's full discussion of the matter in his *History of the Old Covenant*, iii. p. 121 ff., and his essay "Ueber den Dekalog," in Kliefoth and Meyer's *Kirchl. Zeitschrift*, 1858; the paper by E. W. Otto, *Dekalogische Untersuchungen*, 1857; an essay by Fr. W. Schultz in Breslau, "Das Recht der lutherischen Dekalog-Eintheilung," in Rudelbach's and Guerike's *Zeitschr.* 1858; an anonymous essay, "Die Eintheilung des Dekalogs," in the *Erlanger Zeitschr. für Protest. und Kirche*, 1858. Finally, special notice is due to the treatment of the point by Zezschwitz, *Katechetik*, ii. 1, p. 233 ff. [The work of Lemme, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Dekalogs*, contradicts in nearly all points the view here presented, but deserves to be consulted, and in many respects is stimulating.]

(5) The number ten had probably also the practical aim of making the commandments easy to remember by counting them on the fingers.—Bertheau's view of seven groups, each of 7×10 commandments (in his very interesting and instructive book, *The Seven Groups of the Mosaic Laws*, 1840), must be considerably limited; comp. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, ii. p. 163 ff.

(6) See the exactest statement of these, and of the variations of the Samaritan text, in *V.T.* ed. Kennicott, i. p. 149.

(7) The LXX put the wife first in Exodus also, but the other ancient authorities, including the Samaritan Pent., favor the Masoretic text.—Ex. xx. 17: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife."—Deut. v. 18: "Thou shalt not desire (תַּחְמֹד) thy neighbor's wife, and thou shalt not covet (תִּתְאַוֶּה) thy neighbor's house, field," etc.

(8) Thus, on this division, the *first commandment* runs in full thus: "I Jehovah am thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

(9) This division recurs with a peculiar modification in the above-mentioned essay in the *Erlanger Zeitschrift*. This essay makes ver. 2 the first of the ten *words*, though not as a precept, but as the *covenant promise* and display of God's being in its fulness of blessing and clearness. [So also Köhler, i. p. 268. He regards the division of Ex. xx. 3–6 into a prohibition of polytheism and a prohibition of image-worship, as logically possible, but practically worthless; it conflicts with the Old Testament representation of the worship of idols and images as reverence for something else than Jehovah.]

(10) Origen, *Homil. in Exod.* viii., ed. Lommatzsch, p. 91. Hence this division is also called the Origenistic.

(11) Against the union of the first two commandments, as he counts them, he objects, "Quodsi ita putetur, non complebitur decem numerus mandatorum. Et ubi jam erit decalogi veritas?"—The uncertainty then prevalent as to the division of the first and second commandments is testified by the remarkable treatment of the Decalogue by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* vi. 16,—a passage certainly not to be adduced in favor of the Romish or Lutheran division, but not sufficiently freed from obscurity by the remarks of Geffcken, p. 159 ff.—The first trace of the view of the first two commandments accepted in the Jewish division is found in the Babylonian Gemara of the Tract. *Makkoth*, 24 *a*; perhaps Origen, too, *l.c.* p. 90, refers to the same.

(12) Vers. 2–6 form a small *parasha*, then ver. 7 follows as an open *parasha*; then, again, vers. 8–11 are taken together as one, then ver. 12, and so forth.

(13) In general, the position of the *parasha* at that point remained a matter of

discussion among the Jews; cf. Kennicott, *Diss. generalis in V. T.*, ed. Bruns, p. 59.

(14) Because the redemption of Israel from Egypt reveals Jehovah's faithfulness and His might over heathen gods, Israel is to have no other gods beside Him.

(15) As Lutherans have often said; cf. *e.g.* Gerhard, *Loci*, ed. Cotta, v. p. 244; "Primum præceptum deos alienos in genere prohibet, præceptum de sculptilibus certam speciem deorum alienorum exprimit."

(16) When, for example, King Jeroboam I. set up his separatist worship, he did not break the first commandment, ver. 3, for the bovine image which he erected at Bethel was meant to represent Jehovah; but he broke the second commandment, ver. 4, by worshipping Jehovah by an image, comp. § 172. [In favor of the separation of ver. 3 and 4 and the division of Philo, Dillmann also decides in his Commentary on Exodus.]

(17) The meaning of the text in Exodus is, that the house precedes, as the general word including all possessions, and then the individual good things in the house follow. Deuteronomy, on the contrary, has in view the peculiar and honorable position of the wife.

(18) The assertion of the Lutheran theologians, that the ninth commandment forbids *concupiscentia actualis*, the tenth *concupisc. originalis* (cf. Gerhard, *l.c.* p. 247), is a mere invention of polemical zeal.—The differences in the other commandments are only in regard to order. The order of the Masoretic text is supported by the LXX text of Deut. v., Josephus, *l.c.* and Matt. xix. 18. But the LXX text of Ex. xx. differs in placing adultery first, then theft, then murder (οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ φονεύσεις:—the variation is probably due to a natural association of ideas, which suggests that the other commandment regarding family life should follow the fifth commandment concerning the relation of parents and children, and that the prohibition of theft should go along with that of murder). Different, again, is the order in Philo (in both passages cited), and in the New Testament in Rom. xiii. 9, cf. Jas. ii. 11, Luke xviii. 20, Mark x. 19 (where the reading varies), and finally in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 16,—all these placing adultery first, and then murder and theft. (On the order in Matt. xix. 19 and the parallel passages where honor to parents stands after the others, see Stier, *ad loc.*, and Lechler, "Das A.T. in den Reden Jesu," *Stud. und Krit.* 1854, p. 801.) These differences prove nothing more than that there was considerable freedom used in Jewish and Christian antiquity in numbering the commandments.

§ 86.

Continuation of the Decalogue.

The Old Testament does not expressly tell us how the commandments were *divided between the two tables.* If the third of the division given above is correct (Philo, Origen, the Reformed and the Greek church), it is most likely that five precepts are to be assigned to each table, as is assumed by Philo (*l.c.*) and Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 6. *fin.*) (1). The first five precepts are distinguished from those that follow by the reasons annexed to each, and by the appearance of the words "Jehovah thy God" once in each commandment, including the first if vers. 2 and 3 are taken together. The chief objection to this division is, that it gives so much more writing on the first table than on the second—eleven verses on the one, only two on the other; but this point is not decisive. The material difference between the two tables is, as it has been briefly put, that the first contains *præcepta pietatis*, the second *præcepta probitatis.* That the command to honor parents is put among the precepts of piety is justified by the way in which elsewhere the law connects earthly relations of piety with piety toward God; *e.g.*, Lev. xix. 32,

Ex. xxii. 27 (2).—Another view, which is that of Calvin (*Inst.* ii. 8. 12), followed by the Reformed Church, puts four precepts on the first table, and six, commencing with the command to honor parents, upon the second (3). The followers of the Augustinian division generally agree in beginning the second table with the last-mentioned precept, assigning *three* commandments to the first table and *seven* to the second (4). On this view the number three has been associated with the Trinity, and it is urged that seven in the second table is a holy number (5).

The division of the Decalogue, on the Philonic arrangement, which we accept, is the following :—In the first table, the *first* commandment expresses the principle of monotheism, and forbids a plurality of gods. The *second*, in forbidding the use of any image in the worship of the Deity, abolishes the deification of nature in any sense (6). The *Third* ("Thou shalt not take up, apply, the name of Jehovah thy God to vanity") demands reverence to God in life and walk as a whole, by forbidding the most obvious and frequent breach of this duty, the profanation of God's name by false swearing (cf. Lev. xix. 12) or other misuse. The *fourth* commandment lays the basis of the ordinances of worship, by appointing the Sabbath. The *fifth*, the command to honor parents, lays the foundation of all social ordinances of life. The *second* table, which defines duties to neighbors, is obviously based on the common Old Testament trilogy of *hand*, *mouth*, *heart* (cf. *e.g.* Ps. xxiv. 4) (7). It first attacks sins in deed,—injuries to the *life*, *wedded state*, or *property* of a neighbor ; and then sins in word,—injury to a neighbor's good name by false testimony or lies. Finally, since the last commandment forbids even to covet what belongs to another, it is made clear that the obedience demanded is that of the heart, and it is indicated that the fulfilling of the law is not complete except in the sanctification of the inner man. No doubt this exposition of the tenth commandment is disputed. Even Luther gives its sense as being, "that no man shall think or propose to take to himself what is another man's, even with a fair pretext, if his neighbor is injured thereby" (*Larger Cat.* ed. Rechenb. p. 476). In accordance with this, Geffcken and others, also Schultz (8), have made the precept to refer to deceitful undertakings. The Decalogue, they think, literally interpreted, looks only at the outer fulfilling of the law ; the reference of the commandment to its inner principle is left to the *plerosis* of the law (cf. Matt. v. 21 ff.). It may be admitted that the commandment does not mean to draw a sharp line between inner lust and the appearing of that lust in attempts to gratify it (in Mark x. 19 the commandment is represented by *μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς*). But though Schultz appeals to Ex. xxxiv. 24, Mic. ii. 2, to show that חָמַד refers to attempts to touch another man's property, it is undeniable, on the other hand, that the commandment is alluded to in Prov. vi. 25, אַל-תַּחְמֹד בִּלְבָבֶךָ ; and the לֹא תִתְאַוֶּה, which Deuteronomy puts in the second clause, can, in accordance with the constant use of the word (9), refer to nothing but the desire that leads to action. (The LXX give throughout *οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις*, which in Rom. vii. 7 is likewise applied to concupiscence.) A comment on the commandment is to be found in Job xxxi. 1–4.

The definitive and rounded character of the Decalogue, as we have it, is a decisive proof that it *retains its original form*. Recent attempts to mutilate it and strip it of its simplicity (*e.g.* Meier, *Die ursprüngliche Form des Dekalogs*, Mannheim, 1846) rest on the most arbitrary hypotheses (10).

(1) Cf. also Irenæus, ii. 42.

(2) If in Lev. xix. 32, "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man, and fear thy God;" Ex. xxii. 27, "Thou shalt not curse God, nor revile the ruler of thy people,"—reverence to princes and to the aged is deduced from the honor due to God (this is the sense of the connection, cf. Prov. xxiv. 21), the same thing must be still more true of honor to parents, since all authority of superiors is originally derived from that of the father. Similarly, in Lev. xix. 3, the command to honor parents stands with religious precepts in the narrower sense,—the Sabbath law and prohibition of false worship. The reason for this is rightly given by Luther (in his *Exposition of the Decal.*, 1518): "Ideo istud præceptum post præcepta primæ tabulæ ponitur, quia est de illis, qui sunt vicarii Dei. Quare sicut Deus colendus est honore, ita et vicarius ejus." At the same time, this precept makes a fit transition to the second table (such, on the whole, is the view of Philo, *l.c.*).

(3) Because to join the precept concerning parents to the first table is to confound *religionis et caritatis distinctionem*, and at the same time with reference to Matt. xix. 19. The passage Eph. vi. 2 has often been regarded as an evidence that the second table began with the command to honor parents; and so, *e.g.*, the Ambrosiaster on the passage (Appendix to *Ambrosii Opera*, Paris ed. p. 248 f.), assuming the Philonic division, gives four commandments to the first table, and six to the second. The common answer to this view is, that this commandment, even if it stood on the first table, may be called the first in the Decalogue to which a promise is annexed,—the promise in ver. 6 being not only united to a threat, but possessing a more general character, and not standing in any specific relation to the preceding precept. But the true exegesis of Eph. vi. 2 is: which is a prime, *i.e.* a main precept in a promise, *i.e.* because united with a promise (see Winer, *ad l.*). On this view, the passage has nothing to do with the place of the commandment in the Decalogue.

(4) See Augustine, *l.c.; Catechism. Rom.* iii. chap. 5; Luther, *Kurze Form der zehn Gebote*, in the Erlang. ed. of his German works, xxii. p. 5; and *Gr. Katechism.* ed. Rechenb. p. 429.

(5) Were it not that the whole division here presupposed is, as we have seen, false, this view would have in its favor that it makes the writing on each table nearly equal in amount.

(6) It is not to be viewed as a prohibition of all plastic art, as it was taken by Philo,—"Quis rerum div. hær. sit," ed. Mang. p. 496,—and by some excessive purists in the Reformed Churches (compare Geffcken, *l.c.* p. 32 ff.; Zeller, *Das theolog. System Zwingli's*, p. 107 ff.). [According to Lemme, p. 40 ff., the second word does not forbid the making an image of God, but only the paying of religious regard to things of which an image may be made. "Hence the worship of Jahve in the form of an ox could exist, where the second word of the Decalogue was admitted and observed." He finds a striking confirmation of his view in Deut. iv. 15 ff., which he understands as containing the thought, "take heed, since I, Jehovah, the only true God, am an invisible and supersensible being, that you make and adore no visible and corporeal idols." But if this were the meaning of the passage, it would be illogical. A logically correct relation between the premise and the conclusion would be, "Since I, Jehovah, the invisible and supersensible Being, am the only true God." But since not to derive this premise from v.15 is to read nothing of the only true God in the passage, the explanation of Keil holds its own: "Ye have seen no form of me, therefore take heed of making symbolical representations of me."]

(7) So Thomas Aquinas, Savonarola (see Rudelbach, *Savonarola and His Time*, p. 406), Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 492 f.

(8) See Geffcken, pp. 141 ff. and 255 ff.; Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.*, p. 322; and the above-cited article in the *Erlanger Zeitschrift:* "The impulse, asserting itself by all possible efforts, to do injury to our neighbor's property."

(9) The verb אָוָה is always, and the noun אַוָּה almost always, connected with נֶפֶשׁ.

(10) [The critical assaults upon the Pentateuch have increased within the last few years. Against the objection of Reuss (*Gesch. d. heil. Schriften des A. Test.*, § 77), that in order to be able to write the Decalogue as we have it in Ex. xx., upon stone, tablets of enormous size would have been necessary, comp. what Delitzsch, "The Decalogue in Exodus and Deuteronomy," in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift für Kirchl. Wissenschaft*, 1882, No.6, has shown in regard to the size of stones with inscriptions which have been discovered. If we felt obliged with some (*e.g.* Reuss and Wellhausen, p. 404 ff.), to regard the series of enactments in Ex. xxxiv. 11 ff. as a recension of the Decalogue, we should have indeed a very different recension from Ex. xxx., Deut. v., but we could scarcely doubt that the recension in Exodus deserves the preference. Comp. Lemme, p. 5 f.; Dillmann in his commentary on the passage, and generally for the genuineness of the Decalogue the article of Delitzsch already referred to. If Wellhausen were correct in his view of Ex. xxxiv. 11 ff., it would yet be well worth considering that the two accounts in Exodus and the one in Deuteronomy agree in stating that (1) the Decalogue is Mosaic, and (2) that it was written upon tables of stone. Wellhausen therefore has the least possible ground for denying the writing upon tables of stone. But still more significant is the fact that the text of Ex. xxxiv., which varies so much from the two other recensions and contains quite a number of other commandments, has, like those, the *prohibition of images* (comp. v. 17). What right have we then to claim as non-Mosaic the very prohibition in which the diverging recensions agree, not indeed in words, but in the thing itself? (Comp. what Delitzsch in the essay referred to communicates from Wellhausen's article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*). But with the fact established that Moses prohibited images, an important assumption of the Wellhausen construction of history falls. Under the influence of the more recent critical current in respect to the Decalogue, and especially the prohibition of images. Schultz has become more sceptical than before (2d ed., p. 316 f.). But if this commandment was not originally made, *what* commandment stood in its place, "since they were certainly designed to be ten in number"? Comp. on the importance of the testimony given by the Decalogue against the modern talk of the worship of Jehovah under an image as permitted by Moses, Bredenkamp, p. 51 ff.]

§ 87.

Circumcision (1). *Its Historical Origin.*

All theocratic ordinances (cf. § 80, note 2) are in general *signs* and *pledges* of the covenant relation, and in this respect the *observance of the Sabbath* is especially emphasized, Ex. xxxi. 13, 16 f. But the main sign of the covenant (אוֹת בְּרִית, Gen. xvii. 11; בְּרִית בְּבְשַׂרְכֶם, ver. 13) is *circumcision*, which is the constant symbol of covenant obligations, and of consequent covenant rights. It was prescribed not only for Israelites by birth, but also (as already remarked, § 82, 3) for all who were received into the house as slaves, Gen. xvii. 12–27 comp. with Ex. xii. 44–48. On new-born boys it was performed on the eighth day (Gen. xvii. 12; Lev. xii. 3), that is, at the end of the period in which, according to xii. 2, the mother of the child, and therefore probably also the child she was suckling, was considered as unclean; so also, according to Ex. xxii. 29, Lev. xxii. 27, animals could not be offered till eight days old (cf. § 123, 2).

The *historical origin* and the *religious import* of circumcision must be carefully distinguished. It is quite possible that the rite was customary in other tribes before it was introduced in the race of Abraham; and, in fact, the statement in Gen. xvii. presupposes a previous acquaintance with it. But this does not justify the inference that the *significance* of circumcision in the Old Testament must be explained from heathenism (2). Moreover, the historical origin of the rite among

heathen nations lies in the greatest obscurity. It is not probable that the usage spread from a single centre; Diodorus (according to an observation in *Biblioth.* iii. 32) found it even among the Troglodytes, and in recent times it has been found in the South Sea Islands and among heathen negroes. It may be taken as certain that it was a custom of immemorial antiquity among some nations of Western Asia and Africa, but not, as far as appears, among Japhetic races.

[Whether from Jer. ix. 24 f. we may infer that the Egyptians, Edomites, Ammonites, and Moabites practised circumcision (so e.g. Orelli) is doubtful. The 24th verse (A.V. 25th) indeed is unquestionably to be translated: "I visit all them who are circumcised in the foreskin" *i.e.*, all who, although circumcised, are in fact uncircumcised in heart (so Ewald), "Egypt, and Judah, and Edom, and the children of Ammon, and all who are shorn in the corners [of their hair], who dwell in the wilderness." But since at the close of v. 25, the heathen as עֲרֵלִים [uncircumcised] are contrasted with the Israelites as עֲרֵלֵי־לֵב [uncircumcised in heart], it is manifest that in v. 24 מוּל must be taken in a wider signification, so as to include other customs, also such as are indicated by קְצוּצֵי פֵאָה. The latter expression refers to a custom of Arab tribes, who, according to Herodot. iii. 8 cut the hair over the temples in honor of the God Orotal, a practice which was forbidden to the Israelites, Lev. xix. 27, as idolatrous. Nothing is known of the practice of circumcision among the Ammonites and Moabites; the Edomites, at least at a later period, certainly did not have it, since according to the account of Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 9. 1, they were forced by Hyrcanus to accept circumcision. On the other hand, what Herodotus (ii. 104, comp. with chap. 36) and Diodorus, *Biblioth.* i. 28, as well as Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 10. 3, and *Against Ap.* i. 22, relate of the practice of circumcision among the Egyptians is confirmed by the researches of Egyptologists; still the custom appears not to have been universal, but to have been confined to the priests (comp. Philo, *De Circumcisione* ed. Mang ii. p. 210, and the testimony of Origen). Accordingly the possibility of a connection between the Israelitish circumcision and Egypt must be admitted, although it is embarrassed by the account of Gen. xxii. in the time of Abraham; but the matter does not admit of a satisfactory settlement (3).] Wholly to be rejected is another view, which derives the practice from the *Canaanitish Saturn-worship.* The narrative in Gen. xxxiv. shows that it was not originally a Canaanitish usage, and the myth in *Pseudo-Sanchoniathon* (ed. Orelli, p. 36), that Chronos, to avert his father's wrath, circumcised himself and his companions, does not even prove that the Phœnicians viewed circumcision as a consecration to Saturn. The hypothesis, which in recent times has repeatedly been put forth with confidence, that circumcision in Israel is simply a milder form of the *mutilations* performed in the religions of Western Asia in honor of the Deity, cannot adduce a shadow of argument in its favor. Mutilation absolutely excluded from the congregation of God, Deut. xxiii. 2. But even from a purely physical point of view, circumcision was viewed as increasing instead of destroying the power of reproduction (10).

(1) [Comp. the art. "Beschneidung" in Herzog, ii. p. 343 ff., and "Circumcision" in Schaff's Herzog, vol. i.; also F. W. Schultz in Zöckler's *Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften*, i. p. 239 ff.].

(2) So *e.g.* Baur, "Ueber die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Passahfestes und des Beschneidungsritus," *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1832.

(3) [In Josh. v. 4 ff. we are told that circumcision was neglected during the wandering in the desert, and hence had to be reintroduced before the entrance of the Israelites into the land of Canaan. According to Ex. iv. 24 ff. (see § 88) it was neglected in the case of a son of Moses. We see from this how necessary it is to guard against the inference that because a command was not observed, it therefore did not exist.]

§ 88.

Continuation : Religious Import of Circumcision in the Old Testament. The Giving of a Name.

To understand the *Old Testament meaning of circumcision*, we must start from the fact that, according to Gen. xvii., it was instituted before Isaac, the son of promise, was begotten. It obviously presupposes that the natural life is tainted by impurity, which must be removed in those who are called to covenant fellowship with God. Circumcision may be named, with Ewald, "the offering of the body;" and this is carried out in a way that shall declare the propagation of the race of revelation to be consecrated to God (1). The Old Testament nowhere gives expression to the idea, which many entertain, that the propitiation of God's justice is a distinct element in the rite, expressed by the shedding of the blood. This thought is not contained in Gen. xvii. 14, where the cutting off of the uncircumcised is simply the punishment of disobedience. Nor does the idea lie in the passage adduced by Ewald (2), Ex. iv. 24 ff. As Moses is returning to Egypt, Jehovah falls on him—such is the expression—to slay him (which probably indicates a mortal sickness). Then Zipporah cuts off her son's foreskin, and with it (3) touches his, *i.e.* (on the most probable interpretation) Moses' feet, and says, "A bloody bridegroom (חֲתַן־דָּמִים) art thou to me." "So He let him go. She said *bloody bridegroom* in reference to the circumcision." The most obvious explanation of the passage is, that Moses had omitted the circumcision of his son—his eldest son, it seems—probably because Zipporah, the mother, objected to the dangerous operation. For this he is punished; for, as Knobel well observes, "he who is to bring Pharaoh to do his duty to God's firstborn must fulfil his own duty to the firstborn son who is under him, but belongs to God." To save her husband, Zipporah performs the circumcision, but tells him that she is united to him in a marriage the children of which must be bought with blood. The *Rabbinical* exegesis is, that the mother calls the *son* חָתָן [spouse] upon his circumcision, as the Arabs use the verb *hhathana* of circumcision. The act of circumcision would, on this view, be regarded as a betrothal of the new-born offshoot of the people to the covenant God (4). But this whole interpretation is opposed to the fact that it is Moses, and not the child, that is in danger of death because the circumcision is omitted (5). Moreover, and this consideration is decisive, the Old Testament applies the symbol of the bridal and marriage relation only to the fellowship of God with His people—not to His fellowship with individual members of the nation. Circumcision is essentially distinguished from Christian baptism by not constituting an *immediate*, personal relation between God and the recipient of the ordinance. It does not operate as an individual means of grace. Circumcision is no vehicle of sanctifying forces, as it makes no demand in reference to the internal state of the recipient; of whom no more is presupposed than

that he is by birth of Israelitish descent, or, if a born heathen, has been externally incorporated into the commonwealth of Israel. The rite effects admission to the fellowship of the covenant people as an *opus operatum*, securing to the individual as a member of the nation his share in the promises and saving benefits granted to the nation as a whole (6). On the other hand, circumcision certainly makes ethical demands on him who *has* received it. It binds him to obedience to God, whose covenant sign he bears in his body and to a blameless walk before Him (cf. Gen. xvii. 1). Thus it is the *symbol of the renewal and purification of heart.* This signification of the rite is in the Old Testament specially brought out in the use of the phrase, *uncircumcision of heart*, to denote a want of receptivity for the things of God, Lev. xxvi. 41, Jer. ix. 25 (Ezek. xliv. 7); while, on the other hand, the purification of the heart, by which it becomes receptive for the things of God, and capable of executing God's will, is called circumcision of the heart, Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6 (Jer. iv. 4), etc. (7).

With circumcision was combined the *naming of the child*, which although it is first expressly mentioned in Luke i. 59, ii. 21, is clearly indicated by the connection of Gen. xvii. 5 with what follows and xxi. 3 f. By this it is signified that his name expresses his having a place in the divine covenant (8). How frequently the giving of a name was in Israel an act of religious confession, is seen in the meanings of numerous biblical proper names (9).

(1) [H. Schultz, p. 401; F. W. Schultz, in Zöckler's *Handbuch*, i. p. 240; Köhler, i. p. 112, regard circumcision (since the rite is a purification of the seat and spring of life) as a symbol of the purification and sanctification of the whole life. That it binds those who receive it, since they are thereby brought into the covenant community, to the sanctification of the life, has been shown in the preceding section, but whether it directly signifies this is another question. A peculiar view of circumcision is given in Bestmann's *Geschichte der christl. Sitte* i. p. 53, and 248.]

(2) Cf. Ewald, Antiquities, p. 92 f. Also Baur, *l.c.*

(3) יַגִּיעַ Hiphil, as Isa. vi. 7. The עָרְלָה is the foreskin. The expression does not mean "cast it at his feet."

(4) It is natural to apply to the child under the knife of circumcision the account of the closing of the covenant in Ezek. xvi. 6 ff.: "I said to thee when thou wast lying in thy blood, Live. And I sware to thee, and entered into covenant with thee, that thou shouldest be mine."—The further interpretation, that the flowing of the blood contains a propitiation for the inborn guilt and impurity of human nature, might be accepted; but Baur's notion that the passage implies that the rite of circumcision is a propitiation offered to a threatening power of nature, to a gloomy fate, gives the ordinance a sense directly opposed to the Old Testament faith in God.

(5) As rightly observed by Deyling, *de sponso sanguinum*, in his *Observationes Sacræ*, ii. p. 152 ff.

(6) On this point, comp. Zezschwitz, *l.c.* i. p. 222 f.

(7) Other ends contemplated by circumcision, and expressed by ancient writers, must be viewed as at best *secondary:* such is the *dietetic use* of the rite, which, says Herod. ii. 37, is observed καθαριότητος εἵνεκεν; or the *surgical* value, mentioned by Philo, *l.c.* p. 211, as the best means against carbuncle; or the *value for the growth of the nation*, also mentioned by Philo, of an observance that increases fecundity. But Philo also views it as a symbol of the purification of the soul.

(8) Hence in later times Jewish proselytes were wont to take new names. Particulars in my article "Name," in Herzog's *Encyk.* x. p. 193 ff.

(9) The *names* of every nation are an important monument of national spirit and manners, and thus the Hebrew names bear important testimony to the peculiar vocation of this nation. No nation of antiquity has such a proportion of names of religious import. The collection in Matth. Hiller's *Onomasticum Sacrum*, 1706, which requires to be sifted, contains more than a hundred such names of men (comp. also Jerome, *De Nominibus Hebraicis*, Opp. ed. Vall. iii.) ; and how very common these names were, is seen from a glance at the long list of names, *e.g.*, in Chronicles. (There are far fewer religious names of women, in comparison with secular names, especially those taken from favorite animals, plants, etc. Many names of men, too, are taken from the animal kingdom (See Simonis, *Onomast. V. T.* p. 393 ff.), which is explicable from the early nomadic life of the nation.) The older of these names are generally compounded with אֵל, less often with שַׁדַּי and צוּר (cf. § 47, and Ewald's *Lehrbuch*, 8th ed. § 67 ff.) ; while later, especially from David's time, they chiefly appear compounded with יְהוָה. They express something in regard to God's attributes, or His almighty, righteous, and gracious rule, and the like ; or they express thanks, hopes, and petitions to God. Some names contain regular formulæ of prayer ; as, for example, El-yo-enai (1 Chron. iii. 24, iv. 36, vii. 8) = To Jehovah are mine eyes (directed) ; Hodawyah (iii. 24, v. 24) = Thank Jehovah. Specially noticeable is the female name Hatslel-poni (iv. 3) = Give shade, Thou who turnest to me Thy countenance (Ewald, *l.c.* p. 680). The meaning of these names was generally obvious, though sometimes יְהוָה especially was much shortened. (On the last point, see the statements of Caspari, *Ueber Micha den Morasthiten*, p. 8 ff.). Often, no doubt, the giving of such religious names was a mere matter of custom ; even Ahab gave his two sons by Jezebel names compounded with יְהוָה (Ahaziah and Joram). But it is equally certain that in many cases the choice of the name (which seems to have been often made by the mother, Gen. xxix. 32 ff., chap. xxx. ; 1 Sam. i. 20, iv. 21) was an act of religious confession on the part of the parents.—A religious consecration *for girls* is neither prescribed at the institution of circumcision, nor at a later date. This agrees with the dependent position of woman, who has a part in national and covenant life only as the partner of man—as wife and mother (See Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*, i. p. 238). Girls are said to have been named when weaned.

THIRD DOCTRINE.

DIVINE RETRIBUTION.

§ 89.

Blessing and Curse.

As the people bound themselves when the covenant was concluded to observe the law, so Jehovah on His part binds Himself to fulfil to the nation, so long as it observes its obligations, all the promises He makes, and to grant it the fulness of His blessing ; but in the opposite case, to execute on the people the punishment of a breach of covenant. For if man turns against God, God turns against him. Comp., as main passage, Lev. xxvi. 23 f. ; also Deut. xxxii. 21 ; Ps. xviii. 26 f. (1). The *jus talionis*, the principle that a man is dealt with as he himself deals, is, in fact, the principle of penal justice in Mosaism, Ex. xxi. 23 f. (cf. § 99). As the whole theocracy is purely earthly, blessing and curse are confined to the life *on earth*. Where the will of the holy God is to be fulfilled in every action, there must also His righteous rule be seen in the corresponding lot of man. The nation in its ordinary life, as well as its history, must display the

orderings of divine retribution. At the same time it is to be noted, that when Mosaism teaches that piety brings good fortune, and godlessness misfortune, this does not justify one in arguing directly from every misfortune to a corresponding sin, and from every piece of good fortune to corresponding righteousness. For God sometimes shows patience toward the wicked, Gen. xv. 16, and spares them for the sake of the righteous, xviii. 26 ff. ; while, conversely, the righteous are proved and purified by affliction (as in the history of Joseph). But in the end, man's earthly lot must correspond to his desert.

The divine blessing in a single word is Life, חַיִּים, Deut. xxx. 15 f. ; comp. also iv. 1, viii. 1 (2) ; especially frequent in the Proverbs, xii. 28, viii. 35, and elsewhere. Life embraces all the good things that pertain to earthly prosperity : long life on the blessed soil of the promised land, Ex. xx. 12, Deut. iv. 40, xi. 9 ff., xxx. 20 (3) ; the blessing of children, fertility of the soil, victory over enemies, Lev. xxvi. 3 ff., Deut. xxviii. 1 ff. ; compare, in illustration, passages in the Proverbs like iii. 2, iv. 10, etc. But it is not these earthly benefits *in themselves* that make up life,—as has been often charged by those who accuse the Old Testament of gross Eudemonism. The idea that a godless man possessing such external good things is really to be felicitated cannot be entertained from the moral standpoint of Mosaism ; but the earthly good things form a state of felicity only when the possession of them is united with the experience of the gracious presence of the covenant God, so that they are pledges of His favor. Thus, in the leading passage Lev. xxvi., the whole promise of earthly happiness closes in ver. 11 with the words : "And I will set my tabernacle among you ; and my soul shall not abhor you. And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people." Hence it is quite in the spirit of Mosaism when David, Ps. iv. 8, says that he would not exchange his heart's delight in God for the abundance of the godless ; when, xvi. 2, 5, he praises Jehovah as the highest good ; or when, Ps. lxiii. 4, he says, "Thy favor is better than life ;" only that the Old Testament standpoint, as such, does not permit the godly to look away from earthly reward, but rather demands that outward prosperity shall ultimately confirm the fellowship with God in which the godly knows himself to stand (4).—The pattern of *individual* prosperity in the Old Testament is the life of the patriarchs in friendship with God, and in the rich experience of His blessing ; their end "in peace, in a good old age," as the expression runs, Gen. xv. 15, xxv. 8, etc., full of confident hope of the fulfilment of the divine promise resting on their descendants, xlviii. 21, l. 24, etc. (cf. 1 Kings ii. 4). The picture of the happy state of the *nation*—separated from the nations of the earth, endowed with the rich yield of its land, victorious over all its foes, blessed in the experience of the grace of its God—is drawn in Deut. xxxiii. 27–29.

On the other hand, the result of *the breaking of the covenant* on the part of the people issues in *the withdrawal of all these blessings*,—shortening of life, childlessness, scarcity and famine,—that Israel may know that it possesses all natural blessings only as the gift of God (comp., as a main passage, Hos. ii. 8 ff.) ; also political misfortune, defeat by foes (5). And the punishment culminates when the servant of Jehovah who refuses to serve his God is delivered into bondage to other nations—when Israel is banished from the house of God (as it is expressed in Hos. ix. 15), and therefore from the land with which the theocracy is connected,

and scattered among all nations as a timid, despised, maltreated people ; comp., as main passages for these details, Lev. xxvi. 14–39 (6), Deut. xxviii. 15 ff. If the disasters of *heathen* nations are a witness of the powerlessness of their gods, Israel's disasters, on the contrary, are a proof of the reality of Israel's God and of His retributive justice ; cf., especially, Deut. xxxii. 39 : "See now that I, I, am He, and there is no god beside me : I kill, and I make alive ; I wound, and I heal : neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand." Hence, the Old Testament history is not marked by that mendacious patriotism which conceals national adversity (7).

(1) Lev. xxvi. 23 f. : "If ye walk contrary to me (הֲלַכְתֶּם עִמִּי קֶרִי), I also will walk contrary to you (וְהָלַכְתִּי אַף־אֲנִי עִמָּכֶם בְּקֶרִי)." —Ps. xviii. 26 f. ; see § 48.

(2) Deut. xxx. 15 : "See I set before thee this day life and good," etc. ; viii. 1 : "Ye shall keep the commandments, that ye may live."

(3) Ex. xx. 12 : "That thy days may be long," etc. ; Deut. xxx. 20 : "This is thy life and the length of thy days, that thou mayest dwell in the land which Jehovah sware unto thy fathers."

(4) With this point is connected the discussion of the doctrine of retribution in the Hhokhma (§ 245 ff.)

(5) *Four* judicial plagues are prominently mentioned in Ezek. xiv. 21 and other passages,—sword, famine, wild beasts, and pestilence.

(6) The punishments form a climax ; if the first does not succeed, "then I will punish you seven times more for your sins, and break your haughtiness of heart," Lev. xxvi. 18 f. ; and if this too fails, still severer chastisements ensue, ver. 23 ff.

(7) Cf. the remarks of M. v. Niebuhr, *History of Assur and Babel*, p. 5, where the veracity of the Old Testament history is justly contrasted with the patriotic lies of heathen chroniclers.

§ 90.

Solution of the Apparent Contradiction between Divine Election and the Mosaic Doctrine of Retribution. Attacks on the latter.

But if Israel by breaking the covenant is exposed to God's judgment and rejected, this seems to nullify God's decree of election and the realization of the aim of His kingdom, which, though secured by God's covenant oath, is again dependent on man's action. But to this difficulty Mosaism provides an answer. *God's compassionate love is higher than His penal justice*, as is already hinted in the relation of Ex. xx. 6 to ver. 5, and especially is expressed in xxxiv. 6 f. (cf. Deut. vii. 9). God's faithfulness cannot be broken by man's faithlessness. His judgments have a fixed end, and therefore are always in measure, as is taught in the beautiful parable in Isa. xxviii. 23–29. They are so executed that Israel is thereby brought back to God, and the perfecting of God's kingdom secured. Israel is not annihilated in the judgment ; even in banishment, in dispersion among the nations, it must not coalesce with them, but be preserved as a separate nation for the fulfilment of its vocation. The passages in which the Pentateuch solves the apparently insoluble contradiction in the divine decrees, by presenting the prospect of a future restoration of Israel, are the following :—Lev. xxvi. 44, "When they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them." If they now turn to Jehovah, He, remembering his covenant, will take again them

as His people and bring them back. See Deut. xxxii. 36 ff., but especially the chief passage, Deut. xxx. 1 ff. : "And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey His voice : then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will gather thee again from all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will He fetch thee : and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it ; and He will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers." The final restoration of the people is, according to this, *an act of God ;* but it is effected by *ethical means*, through the *conversion* of the people, for the order of God's kingdom excludes all magical means. The end of this conversion is attained when, by the operation of divine grace, that renovation of heart is accomplished in virtue of which the law is no longer to the people an external command, but, through the power of God, the cheerful expression of their own will and purpose. For, as the last-cited passage continues (ver. 6), "Then the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Thus, in spite of man's sin and faithlessness, the realization of the divine decree of election. the perfecting of the people of God, is firmly based in God's faithfulness and mercy (Rom. xi. 25–36) (1).

The *attacks made on Mosaism by Deists and by later theologians, on account of its doctrine of retribution*, rest mainly on the assertion that Mosaism has no higher motives to present in favor of obedience to the law than the selfish desire of reward and the fear of punishment ; that this national delusion, as De Wette calls the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, made the nation of Israel vastly unhappy, and engendered a gloomy view of life, which destroys the fair harmony of man with the world, in which the Greek appears so nobly (2) ; while, finally, objection is made to the absence of a doctrine of future retribution.—The general answer to these objections is contained in our previous statements. A morality which rests on the basis of faith in the elective grace and providential faithfulness of the covenant God, and whose doctrine of the good culminates in the prominence assigned to fellowship with this God, cannot surely be accused of gross, sensuous Eudemonism. It is certainly a limitation in Mosaism, in comparison with the higher stage of New Testament revelation, that fellowship with God cannot be thought of apart from corresponding earthly blessings, and that life is not yet understood as life everlasting ; but, on the other hand, the earnest way in which Mosaism carries out the postulate of a moral government of the world, the manner in which it forbids all fatalistic consolation in adversity and arouses the conscience of the sufferer, and in general, the way in which it instils into the whole life reverence for a holy, divine power present in all human events, elevate this religion far above all forms of heathenism. Thus the moral life of Israel has a freshness and energy which stand in the strongest contrast with the Egyptian civilization, which is ever busy only with thoughts concerning death and the future state (3).

(1) The application of this law of divine grace to a single family—viz. that of David—is given in 2 Sam. vii. 14 ff.

(2) See especially an essay by De Wette, which in other respects contains much that is good, "Beitrag zur Charakteristik des Hebraismus," in Daub's and Creuzer's *Studien*, iii. p. 241 ff.

(3) Yet the foundation of a hope of immortality that is full of meaning—such a hope as can only arise in connection with the fact of the vanquishing of death—is laid in the institution of a fellowship of man with God, the ever-living. The imperishableness of this fellowship is felt to be sure, in the first instance, because God's eternity secures the everlasting duration of His people (cf. Ps. cii. 28 f.); but the growing intensity with which, in the further development of the Old Testament religion, fellowship with God becomes the experience of individual saints, serves to arouse a presentiment of the eternal destiny of the individual also (see my *Commentationes*, p. 71 ff.). [Art. "Volk Gottes."] We shall connect with this point in the Prophetic Eschatology (comp. § 225 f.).

SECOND CHAPTER.

THE THEOCRACY.

§ 91.

The Idea of the Divine Kingship.

The form of government in the commonwealth founded by Moses is the *government of God*,—θεοκρατία, as Josephus, who seems to have invented this word, calls it (1). *Jehovah is the King of Israel.* The Old Testament idea of the divine kingship expresses, not God's general relation of power toward the world (as being its creator and supporter), but the special relation of His government toward His elect people (2). The patriarchs called Him *Lord* and *Shepherd*, and it is not until He has formed a people for Himself by bringing Israel up out of Egypt that He is called, Ex. xv. 18, "He who is *King* for ever and ever." But the real beginning of His kingly rule was on that day on which He bound the tribes of Israel into a community by the promulgation of the law and the forming of the legal covenant: "Then He became King in Jeshurun," Deut. xxxiii. 5 (3). The idea of the divine kingship is therefore connected with that of the Holy One and Creator of Israel;" comp. Isa. xliii. 15, Ps. lxxxix. 19. On the divine kingship in Israel, compare also the passages, Num. xxiii. 21; Isa. xli. 21, xliv. 6; Ps. x. 16. In Ps. xlviii. 3, Jehovah is called the "Great King;" in xxiv. 7 ff., the "King of Glory." Although He has been the King of His people in all ages, Ps. lxxiv. 12, He will not become the King of the nations until a future time, when He comes in the last revelation of His kingdom (4). *In Him, as King, all political powers are united* (their earthly bearers are only Jehovah's organs); church and state, if we may speak thus, are here joined in immediate union. As King, He is the *Lawgiver* and *Judge* of His people, Isa. xxxiii. 22. Legal and civil regulations are but an efflux of the divine will. Some things, indeed, that rest on usage are adhered to or tolerated on account of the σκληροκαρδία of the people (comp. Matt. xix. 8); still even these things are limited

and regulated by provisions of the law. Lastly, as King, God is also the *leader of His people's army* (5) (comp. Num. xxiii. 21); Israel forms the hosts of Jehovah, Ex. xii. 41 (צִבְאוֹת יהוה) (He goes before them as leader in the combat, Num. x. 35); Israel's battles are מִלְחֲמוֹת יְהוָה, Num. xxi. 14. An example of this is the first battle with Amalek, in which Israel conquers by Moses' hands held up in prayer (Ex. xvii. 8–16) (6).

(1) Josephus says in his book *c. Ap.* ii. 17: "Οἱ μὲν μοναρχίαις, οἱ δὲ ταῖς ὀλίγων δυναστείαις, ἄλλοι δὲ τοῖς πλήθεσιν ἐπέτρεψαν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῶν πολιτευμάτων. Ὁ δ' ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης εἰς μὲν τούτων οὐδοτιοῦν ἀπεῖδεν, ὡς δ' ἂν τις εἴποι βιασάμενος τὸν λόγον, θεοκρατίαν ἀπέδειξε τὸ πολίτευμα, θεῷ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸ κράτος ἀναθείς, καὶ πείσας εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἅπαντας ἀφορᾶν," etc.

(2) The nation therefore calls on God as its King in this specific sense, Ps. xliv. 5, lxviii. 25, etc.

(3) The subject in Deut. xxxiii. 5 is Jehovah; it is quite wrong to take Moses for the subject.

(4) This will be further shown in the Prophetic Theology (comp. § 227 f.).

(5) Στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ, as Josephus expresses himself (*Ant.* iv. 8. 41).

(6) The description of the theocratic regulations is most fitly divided into two sections: in the first, we have to exhibit the whole theocratic organism, and, along with this, to treat of the connected ordinances of law and justice; in the second, we have to delineate the ordinances of worship.

FIRST DOCTRINE.

THE THEOCRATIC ORGANISM, AND THE ORDINANCES OF LAW AND JUSTICE CONNECTED THEREWITH.

I. THE THEOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF THE PEOPLE.

§ 92.

The Division into Tribes. Israel's Representation before Jehovah.

The natural division of the people is into *twelve*, or, as Joseph receives double tribal rights in Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen. xlviii. 5), *thirteen tribes*, מַטּוֹת or שְׁבָטִים (LXX φυλαί),—the former of these words apparently designating the tribes more in their genealogical division and natural relations, the latter (according to the meaning of שֵׁבֶט, *Sceptre*) more their political constitution (1). But although Levi received no special tribal territory, the number twelve still remains for all political relations; while, on the contrary, wherever Levi is numbered, the two tribes of Joseph appear as only one (2). Thus, in the prophecy in Ezek. xlviii., in speaking of the division of the land, vers. 1–7, 23–28, Manasseh and Ephraim are reckoned as two tribes; and on the contrary, in vers. 30–35, where it is said that the twelve gates in the New Jerusalem shall be called by the names of the twelve tribes, Joseph is reckoned as but one tribe (3).—These twelve tribes together form the priestly kingdom (מַמְלֶכֶת כֹּהֲנִים, Ex. xix. 6). But though Korah and his company are so far in the right, Num. xvi. 3, that "all the congregation are holy together, and the Lord is among

them," yet the idea is inadequately realized. On account of their uncleanness and sinfulness (comp. Ex. xix. 21, etc.), the congregation are able to draw near to God only by means of a *propitiation* (comp. § 127). Every one who at twenty years of age entered the army of Jehovah had to pay at the mustering the sum of half a shekel of the sanctuary as כֹּפֶר, "covering," propitiation, Ex. xxx. 11–16,—the rich giving no more and the poor no less, because they are equal in God's sight (comp. § 136, 4). A whole series of other institutions is directed to such propitiation; but this thought is pre-eminently expressed by the introduction of a *representative* body between Jehovah and the people. A *priesthood springing out of natural relations existed even before the time of Moses*, comp. Ex. xix. 22. In the time of the patriarchs, the father appears as the priestly intercessor for his family (comp. also Job i. 5), or the prince as priest to his tribe, as kingship and priesthood were united in Melchisedek; and Jethro also is to be reckoned as the spiritual and civil chief of Midian (רַבָּא דְמִדְיָן, Onk. Ex. ii. 16, iii. 1), as imâm and sheikh. Thus, too, the priests mentioned in Ex. xix. 22 must have possessed the priestly dignity in virtue of a higher natural position, whether, as Jewish tradition declares, and as false exegesis finds in Gen. xlix. 3 (4), the priesthood was originally connected with the right of the first-born, and therefore the charge of the public worship was intrusted to the first-born before the introduction of the Aaronic priesthood (Mishna, *Sebahim* xiv. 4) (5), or whether those elders who in Ex. xxiv. 11 are called אֲצִילֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (nobles) were called to this honor. At a still later time (Num. xvi. 2) it is the princes of the congregation (נְשִׂיאֵי עֵדָה) who are its representatives (קְרִיאֵי), and especially the princes of the tribe of the first-born, Reuben, who demand a priesthood on the broadest basis.—But all claims arising from the right of nature are set aside by the theocratic law. As Israel as a whole is a holy people only in virtue of the divine *election*, and as all the regulations of the covenant, especially those of worship (comp. § 112), rest on the divine *enactment*, the bestowing of the priesthood can also be only an *act of divine grace*. Those only whom God Himself has called, whom He has brought thither and sanctified to Himself (Num. xvi. 7 compared with Heb. v. 4), are permitted to draw near to God in intercession for the people. Certainly "out of the midst of the children of Israel," for the representative must have a natural connection with the people itself; but *Aaron* and his sons are *chosen* for the priesthood from the midst of this people by the divine good pleasure (Ex. xxviii. 1, comp. 1 Sam. ii. 28); they receive their priesthood *as a gift*, Num. xviii. 7 (מַתָּנָה). And this divine act of election took place (see Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 9) earlier than the occurrence in Ex. xxxii. (26) ff., when the tribe of Levi won for itself a blessing, through its zeal for the honor of Jehovah (6). From that time forward, however, *Levi as a tribe* appears in a mediatorial position between Jehovah and the people (7); the *race of Aaron* rises from its midst with a specific priestly prerogative, and in such a way that the priesthood itself culminates in the *office of high priest*. There are therefore three grades in the representation of the people before Jehovah.

(1) The tribal constitution which (comp. § 27) was formed during the time of the people's stay in Egypt was not dissolved by Moses, but recognized in the theocratic regulations. Twelve as the number of the tribes was regarded as expressing the normal state of the covenant people, and therefore (Judg. xxi. 17) it is

regarded as a calamity, to be avoided at any price, that a tribe should disappear out of Israel.—This number twelve is so entirely identified with the normal state of the theocracy, that it continues to be the signature of God's people even in prophecy (comp. § 224). In the New Testament, too, the *twelve* tribes continue to be the type of the covenant people (Acts xxvi. 7 ; Rev. vii. 4 ff.), to which the number of the apostles corresponds.

(2) [According to Wellhausen (i. p. 123 ff., and especially p. 148 ff.), the religious order known as Levites was not identical with the ancient tribe of Levi. The latter, in the age of the Judges, disappeared and was lost among the dwellers in the wilderness or among their own people in consequence of a catastrophe referred to in Gen. xlix. 5–7. This history of the tribe of Levi is in his view supported only by that passage, regarded as a prediction after the event, and by the narrative in Gen. xxxiv. The difficulty of satisfactorily explaining, on this theory, how the priestly order ever came to bear the name of Levites he himself admits. This latter fact becomes all the more surprising, on Wellhausen's assumption, that bad associations were connected with the name of the lost tribe of Levi. If the tribe of Levi, like that of Simeon, the fate of which it is claimed to have shared, once possessed an allotment in some one part of Palestine, why was every remembrance of it lost, while mention is made of the allotment of Simeon (Josh. xix. 1 ff.) ? The blessing of Moses in Deut. xxxiii. presents another difficulty in the way of accepting Wellhausen's view ; for it is unnatural to suppose that while all the other utterances in this chapter refer to *tribes*, that alone concerning Levi, which occurs in the midst of them, is to be referred to an *order* (comp. Wellhausen, p. 138 ff. ; against him Bredenkamp, p. 174 ; Orelli, in Herzog, 2d ed., art. "Levi," p. 629). Observe that even the position of the utterance appears to be determined by the genealogical point of view. Wellhausen himself (p. 148) calls attention to the fact that the tribe of Levi belongs to the group of the four eldest sons of Leah. Thus the position of the utterance after that concerning the two other sons of Leah is explained, while no mention is made of Simeon.]

(3) So also in Jacob's blessing, Gen. xlix., and in that of Moses, Deut. xxxiii.

(4) Comp. the Targums of Onkelos and Jerus. Onkelos interprets, "Three things belonged to Reuben—birthright, priesthood, and kingship." Luther also translates, "The chief in the sacrifice."

(5) The young men who were set apart by Moses to assist at the sacrifice (Ex. xxiv. 5) are taken by Onkelos as the first-born sons, and the priests mentioned in xix. 22, 24 are so understood by Rashi and Aben Esra. In opposition to this explanation of the latter passage, comp. Vitringa, *Observationes Sacræ*, i. p. 284. [Article, "Levi, Leviten, Levitenstädte," in Herzog.]

(6) It is therefore not right to say that the election of the tribe of Levi to the *priesthood* was a reward for that deed (comp. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* iii. 19).

(7) In whatever way we understand the difficult passage Ex. xxxii. 29, it is clearly indicated in Deut. xxxiii. 9, which obviously refers to Ex. xxxii., that the tribe, by its zeal for Jehovah's honor, showed itself worthy of this share in the priestly honor which Aaron's race enjoyed (comp. § 29, note 2). [Wellhausen indeed (comp. p. 138 f.) denies this reference, and finds in the passage the thought that the priest must act, in the service of Jehovah, as if he had no father, mother, brother, or children ; for in order to become a priest he must break away from all family bonds. Of the latter alleged duty the history says nothing, and the argument of Wellhausen from the history of Samuel does not prove it. That the words "neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew he his own children," even if the verbs are translated in the present tense, would not be accordant with his explanation, is felt by Wellhausen himself. That one should forsake not only father and mother, but also wife and children, in order to enter the priesthood, he says, could hardly have been the rule. The case in Deut. xxxiii. 9 is only mentioned as an extreme example of self-sacrifice. In no case can we infer from it that celibacy was required, but only that the priesthood scarcely gave the means of support to a man, to say nothing of a family (!) Dillmann, on the other hand, holds fast the reference to Ex. xxxii. 29 (see his *Commentar.* on the latter passage).

Bredenkamp (p. 174 ff.) has thoroughly discussed the passage in opposition to Wellhausen.] Deut. x. 8 does not contradict this, since this passage must be taken in connection with vers. 1–5 and 10 f., which likewise refer to Ex. xxxii. ff. Vers. 6 and 7 are shown by their whole form to be an interpolation which interrupts the close connection between vers. 5 and 8. We may conjecture, in view of ix. 20, that the author of this gloss made the insertion in order to indicate the acceptance of Moses' prayer on behalf of Aaron, who died much later. On this passage compare especially Ranke, *Unters. über den Pentateuch*, ii. p. 283. Riehm, on the contrary (*die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 237 f.) forces again on Deuteronomy a gross discrepancy from the book of Numbers, as if the former book represents the Levites as chosen only after Aaron's death, in the fortieth year of the wandering !—As regards the sense of Ex. xxxii. 29, it is to be observed that the view which sees in this passage a repetition of the words in which Moses summons the Levites to execute judgment against their brethren, as a sacrifice well pleasing to God, is not only liable to other objections, but does not conform to the strict usage of *Vav consec. cum imperf.* Instead of וַיֹּאמֶר, we should on this view look rather, as in iv. 26, for אָז אָמַר. From the common use of the expression "to fill the hand" (xxviii. 41, xxix. 9 ; 2 Chron. xiii. 9), we should be led to think of an offering of consecration, which the Levites had to offer up after the deed was executed, in reference to the calling which was now set before them [so also Dillmann]. What can be brought against this explanation has been best collected by J. G. Carpzov, *Apparatus hist. crit. antiquitatum sacri cod.*, p. 103 f. On the contrary, even Targ. Jon. finds in the passage a command to bring an offering of expiation for the shed blood ; and Kurtz, *History of the Old Covenant*, iii. p. 167, has given the same explanation [while Köhler, i. p. 279, regards it as an offering for the expiation of the apostasy of the people].

1. THE LEVITES (1).

§ 93.

The Mode and Meaning of the Representation of Israel by the Levites.

The circumstances of the *dedication of the tribe of Levi* are represented in the following manner in the Pentateuch. We are told in Ex. xiii., that from the night in which Israel was redeemed all the first-born males among man and beast were dedicated to Jehovah. But instead of all the first-born sons then living from a month old and upward, He accepts the Levites as a standing gift of the people (comp. Num. viii. 16 ; and instead of the people's cattle, he takes the cattle of the Levites, Num. iii. 11 f., 45 (2). [By the first-born, who were represented by the Levites, are meant those both on the father's and the mother's side, that is, the father's first-born by each of his wives] (3).

With regard to the sense in which the Levites took the place of the first-born sons according to one view, the Levites were accepted by Jehovah to take charge of the *priestly services*, which were previously incumbent on the first-born as the *representatives of the families ;* according to another view, the substitution of the Levites is to be looked upon under the aspect of *sacrifice.* In order to get at the right understanding, we must proceed from the latter conception. Nowhere in the Levitical law is anything said of an entrance on priestly *rights* which belonged already to the first-born children. The idea lying at the root of the dedication of the Levitical tribe is rather this :—As the Egyptians on account of their guilt were punished in their first-born children, so that the children took the place of

the whole nation, and bore as a sacrifice the curse of extermination which lay on all; so, conversely, Israel—the people chosen by Jehovah and redeemed from the bondage of man—in testimony that it owes its existence and possessions to divine grace alone, that it is *indebted* to its God for all that it has and is, must bring to God, as *payment*, the firstling blessings of his house in the place of the whole. But the offering of men is not executed by sacrificing them, but by giving them up for permanent service in the sanctuary (comp. the story of Hannah, 1 Sam. i. 22, 28). But instead of all the first-born sons of the people performing this service in the sanctuary, one tribe is permanently taken by divine choice from the ordinary callings of life, and placed in a closer and particular relation toward God, in order to take charge of the service in the sanctuary, and thus to mediate for the people the communion of the sanctuary. The Levites were thus, in the first place, the living *sacrifice* by which the people rendered *payment* to Jehovah for owing their existence to Him; but secondly, since the Levites, in consequence of this, performed in the sanctuary the service which the people ought to have rendered through their first-born, but could not on account of their uncleanness (Num. xviii. 22 f.), they serve, in their substitution, as a *covering* or an atonement (לְכַפֵּר) also for the people who come near to the sanctuary, Num. viii. 19. In the former respect, the Levites are given to the priests (to whom, in general, the use of the sacrifice of the firstlings is given), as a *gift* assigned to them by Jehovah (xviii. 6, comp. with iii. 9, viii. 19); they shall (as is said in xviii. 2, comp. with ver. 4, with allusion to their name) *join themselves* to the priest (יִלָּוּ), and *serve* him. In the second respect, the Levites themselves obtain a certain share in the *mediatorial* position which belongs to the priesthood, and thus the Levitical tribe forms the *basis* of the gradually ascending representation of the people before God. Emphatically as it is inculcated on the Levites (comp. xvi. 10) that the dedication of their tribe does not involve the priesthood proper, yet their relative share in the priestly mediatorship, in distinction from the other tribes, is indicated very clearly in the *regulations of encampment*,—in the Levites having to encamp with the priests, immediately around the sanctuary, "that wrath come not on the congregation of the children of Israel," i. 53. comp. § 20).—What has been said explains further the difference which exists in reference to the Levites between the legislation in the middle books of the Pentateuch and Deuteronomy—namely, that the *former gives special emphasis to the difference between the priests and Levites, while Deuteronomy*, on the contrary, *takes priests and Levites together*, as one holy estate in distinction from the people (6). The two views do not contradict, but supplement each other. That Deuteronomy, as has often been said, knows no difference between the Levites who were priests and those who were not is decidedly incorrect; for in Deuteronomy, where simply לֵוִי or לְוִיִּם stands, it is the *common Levites* who are meant; see especially xviii. 6–8, comp. with vers. 3–5 (4). This is true, however, that both are treated as *essentially a single whole*, as is manifest from the fact, that while the middle books of the Pentateuch are wont to denote the priests as "sons of Aaron," in Deuteronomy, on the contrary, the Levitical character of the priesthood is made *prominent* by the priests being called "sons of Levi" (xxi. 5, xxxi. 9), or "Levitical priests" (הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם), xvii. 9, 18 (the same in Josh. iii. 3, etc.), and that also the vocation of the Levites is designated by terms which are elsewhere applied to the distinctively priestly calling, viz. "to minister in Jeho-

vah's name" (שָׁרֵת בְּשֵׁם יהוה), "to stand before Jehovah" (עָמַד לִפְנֵי יהוה); *e.g.* Deut. xviii. 7, comp. with ver. 5 and xxi. 5, xvii. 12 (5). In the blessing of Moses (xxxiii. 8 ff.), the idea of the priesthood is similarly transferred to the tribe; and accordingly the ordinance of the priesthood is, as Mal. ii. 4 designates it, a covenant with Levi. (6).

(1) Compare my article, "Levi, Leviten, Levitenstädte," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*

(2) Since (Num. iii. 43) the number of first-born sons in the nation amounts to 22,273, and the number of the Levites, on the contrary, only to 22,000, the overplus is compensated by a fine of five shekels apiece, to be paid to Aaron and his sons (vers. 46–51).—There must be a mistake in the reckoning in vers. 22, 28, 34, which would give a sum of 22,300; see Kurtz, *l. c.* 200 f. Others suppose that these 300 supernumerary Levites were themselves first-born children.

(3) [See Lund, *Alte jüd Heiligthümer*, p. 622, and Keil in Hävernick's *Introduction to the Pentateuch* i. p. 308.

(4) [Comp. the explanation of this passage in Riehm, *l. c.* p. 35 f.].

(5) On the contrary, Num. xvi. 9 says the Levites are appointed לַעֲמֹד לִפְנֵי הָעֵדָה לְשָׁרְתָם.

(6) [The question in regard to the persons employed in conducting the ceremonial worship has become quite prominent in the recent works on the development of the religious history of Israel. Comp. Wellhausen, i. 123 ff.; Orelli's supplement to the art. "Levi, Leviten," in the 2d ed. of Herzog; Delitzsch, art. "Leviten," in Riehm; also in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, H. vi.; Bredenkamp, p. 174 ff.; Dillmann's *Commentar.* on Ex. and Lev., p. 457 ff., and especially 461; Kittel, "The latest phase of the Pentateuch Question," in the *Theol. Stud. aus Württemberg*, 1881, p. 147 ff. [Also W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 360, 436; Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, pp. 76–83; Curtiss, *The Levitical Priests.*] According to Wellhausen, the whole priestly body, which had nothing in common with the ancient tribe of Levi except the name (see § 92, note 1) bore the name of *Levites.* Originally few in number, they became in time numerous and influential, but no difference existed between Levites who were priests and those who were not. [All priests were Levites, and all Levites were priests.] The distinction between them, for which a preparation was made by the superior authority attached to the temple in Jerusalem and its priesthood in comparison with the country sanctuaries and their priests, arose in consequence of the centralizing of the worship under Josiah. The Deuteronomic legislator demanded, however, for the country priests the right to officiate at the temple in Jerusalem, but Ezekiel subsequently demanded (xliv. 6 ff.), as a punishment to them for having ministered at the high places (a service which previously was as legitimate as that in Jerusalem), that the country priests should be degraded to the rank of inferior servants in the temple worship. What was simply a result of the relations and the selfishness of the Jerusalem priesthood was thus rested by Ezekiel upon a moral ground. "He wrapped an ethical cloak around the logic of facts." The passage in Ezekiel, xliv. 6 ff., forms the point of departure for this view. But while Wellhausen makes it teach that Ezekiel *first made* the distinction in question in the Levitical order, others hold that the prophet in this and other passages takes the distinction for granted, and that consequently the passage proves nothing, or rather the contrary of what Wellhausen supposes. (So Dillmann, p. 461: "Ezekiel, in xl. 45 f., xlii. 13, xliii. 19, presupposes such a distinction as a matter of course, and in chap. xliv., where he expressly speaks concerning it, he will have, according to v. 6 ff., the original order restored"). Against this whole theory of the post-Ezekiel origin of the Levitical legislation in the middle books of the Pentateuch, comp. especially Delitzsch in Riehm: "That the legislation in the middle books of the Pentateuch is not of a date after the time of Ezekiel follows necessarily from the fact that the official

position and division of the Levites after the exile was in a stage of development, which is not reflected, either as to fact or language, in the legislation." Indeed, if we take the ground that the tribe of Levi constituted the order of the Levites, we can scarcely come to any other opinion than that the Levites were not all priests.]

§ 94.

Official Functions, Dedication, and Social Position of the Levites.

The *official functions* of the Levites are placed along with the service of the priests under the common point of view of "keeping the charge of the sanctuary" (מִשְׁמֶרֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ) (comp. Num. iii. 28, 32 with xviii. 5), but at the same time they are definitely distinguished from the latter. The charge of "all concerns of the *altar* (1) and within the veil" (Num. xviii. 7), with which, also, the performance of ceremonial acts connected with the other sacred furniture is united, falls exclusively to the priests (3). On the contrary, the service of the Levites is called the service of Jehovah's *dwelling-place*, or of the *tabernacle* of meeting (comp. the different expressions, i. 53, xvi. 9, xviii. 4); it is designated as military service (צָבָא), iv. 3, 30, viii. 24 (in the camp of Jehovah, 1 Chron. ix. 19), and at a later period it was still organized entirely in a military manner. During the wandering in the wilderness, the Levites had the charge of the taking down, carrying, and setting up of the holy tabernacle (Num. i. 50 ff.); also of the carrying of the sacred furniture, particularly the ark of the covenant (comp. Deut. x. 8, xxxi. 25) (3). The division of these duties among the three Levitical families is given in Num. iii. 25–37, chap. iv. According to chap. iv. 3, 23, 30, the Levites were called to this service from their thirtieth to their fiftieth year; on the contrary, viii. 24 ff. represents their time of service as beginning as early as with their twenty-fifth year (4).—But the functions mentioned in the book of Numbers refer only to the time of the people's *wandering*. There are no directions in the Pentateuch, or even in Deuteronomy, concerning the services of the Levites in future, during the *settlement* of the people in the Holy Land (5). How entirely different would this be if the Levitical legislation of the Pentateuch were as late a production as the modern critics maintain! (6).

The *act of the consecration* of the Levites is described in Num. viii. 5–22. The first set of these ceremonies aims at purification, טָהֵר (an expression which, moreover, in vers. 6 and 21, stands as a designation of the whole act of consecration, while, on the contrary, Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 1, קִדֵּשׁ is used in speaking of the consecration of the priests). The purification falls (ver. 7) into three parts,—*sprinkling* with the water of purification (מֵי חַטָּאת); *shaving* ("they shall cause the razor to pass over their whole body"); *washing of their clothes*. There is no mention of investiture, as at the dedication of the priests, for the Pentateuch does not recognize any special official costume for the Levites (such as appears later). Thus purified, the Levites become fitted *to be given to Jehovah*. This is divided into the following ceremonies:—The *laying on of hands* (ver. 10). When the sacrifices which were to be offered afterward had been prepared (ver. 8), the whole congregation was to gather before the holy tabernacle. "Then bring the Levites before Jehovah, and the children of Israel (namely, the representatives of

the congregation) shall lay their hands on the Levites." By this action the intention of the people to present the Levites as an offering in their name is expressed (§ 126). The actual presentation is performed by *waving* or swinging (תְּנוּפָה, comp. § 133), the ceremony which takes place at all the offerings which God relinquishes as a gift to the priest (7). In the case of the Levites, it is generally understood as a simple leading backward and forward. Then the sin-offering and burnt-offering are presented in the name of the Levites (who must therefore lay their hands, ver. 12, on the sacrificial animals), to atone for them (לְכַפֵּר עַל־הַלְוִיִּם); for even those whom God has accepted as a gift must be atoned for before they begin to serve in the sanctuary (8).

In order that the tribe of Levi might be withdrawn from ordinary labor,—which in the theocratic state was agricultural,—and might give itself completely to its sacred vocation, *no inheritance as a tribe* was assigned to it (Num. xviii. 23). What Jehovah said to Aaron (Num. xviii. 30) is in Deut. x. 9 applied to the whole tribe of Levi—namely, that Jehovah Himself would be their inheritance. The tribe is scattered among all the other tribes, in the territories of which (Num. xxxv. 6) it received forty-eight towns (9), with their suburbs (ver. 7, מִגְרָשִׁים), that is, pasturages. In this law, moreover, the priests are included along with the Levites. The thirteen special towns for the priests are first mentioned in Josh. xxi. 4 (10). Without doubt, this dispersion served the purpose of placing the Levites in a position where they could watch over the keeping of the law. The tithes were assigned to them *for their support* (more further on, § 136, 3). This was not an over-abundant endowment. Even when the tithe was conscientiously paid, it was no certain income (and, besides, it did not increase with the increase of the tribe). Moreover, if the people showed themselves averse to this tax (as was to be expected in times of falling away from the theocratic law), the tribe of Levi was subjected to unavoidable poverty. And thus Deuteronomy represents the Levites as placed in a position requiring the support of alms, and as standing in the same line with strangers, widows, and orphans (xii. 19, xiv. 27, 29, and elsewhere) (11).

(1) Viz. both the altar of burnt sacrifice and the altar of incense, comp. 1 Chron. vi. 34.

(2) The attempt of the Levite, Korah, to offer incense is punished as a criminal offence, Num. xvi.

(3) The ark, however, must first be covered by the priests, Num. iv. 4 ff.; the sight of it was absolutely forbidden to the Levites, ver. 17 ff.

(4) This apparent contradiction is most easily solved by the assumption that the former passages refer to service in transporting the tabernacle, and the latter to Levitical service in general (comp. Hävernick's *Introduction*, p. 432); on another explanation (comp. Ranke, *Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, ii. p. 159), the time from the twenty-fifth to the thirtieth year is to be regarded mainly as a preparation for entering on the full service.—From fifty years old and upward the Levites are not to be compelled to do the work of serving, but only to help their brethren (probably as overseers, or by instructing the younger men).

(5) In *Deuteronomy* the vocation of the Levites, as has been already indicated, is included under the priestly calling in general (x. 8, xviii. 7), but this without in any way assigning to the Levites those services which especially belong to the priests. For a mixture of the offices of the two classes does not at all follow from the fact that the priests, xxxi. 9, and also the Levites, ver. 25, are designated as bearers of the ark of the covenant. Subsequent usage (Josh. iii., vi. 6; 1 Kings

viii. 3 ff.) shows that the ark was carried by the priests on all solemn occasions; while, on the contrary, this labor was incumbent on the Levites during the wandering in the wilderness (so, too, in 2 Sam. xv. 34).

(6) Riehm is very far from having made out his point, that the Deuteronomist, in what he says of the Levites, assumes a state of things that first arose after the time of Hezekiah. On the contrary, as will appear more clearly afterward, Stähelin ("Versuch einer Geschichte der Verhältnisse des Stammes Levi," in the *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1855, p. 708 ff.) is probably in the right when he finds that what is contained in Deuteronomy in reference to the Levites entirely harmonizes with the time after Joshua.

[It is not unreasonable to demand of the supporters of the hypothesis of the post-exilic origin of the priestly legislation, that they point out a *design*, which shall make its origin intelligible. In the law concerning the Levitical cities, the impossibility of executing which in that age is manifest, and is recognized without reserve by Wellhausen, an aim may indeed, with some painstaking, be supposed to be, that thereby the last and decisive difference was got rid of, which distinguished the actual tribes from the Levites, viz., the tribal independence and compactness which were indicated by fixed settlements (Wellhausen, i. p. 167). The absurdity of such legislation he endeavors to relieve by observing that "the execution of the law was probably postponed till the time of the Messiah. But the absurdity of making laws concerning the duties of the Levites in the wilderness for the age of the second temple cannot be relieved by referring them to the Messianic age, and the [supposed] tendency to give to the later legislation the "costume of the Mosaic age" does not explain satisfactorily why laws should be made which for the present have no sense, and without the specific form which the present demanded.]

(7) See Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 283.

(8) Special provisions for the personal conduct and regulation of the life of Levites (such as Lev. xxi. gives for the priests) are not contained in the Levitical laws in the Pentateuch.

(9) Of which, six are appointed to be cities of refuge; comp. *infra*, the avenging of blood, § 108.

(10) The list in 1 Chron. vi. 46 ff. varies in many ways from the statement in the book of Joshua.—The allotment of these towns is doubtless not to be understood as if the Levites were their only possessors, but that they received only the needful number of houses, along with the suburbs around the town to pasture their cattle, while the other houses, and the fields and granges belonging to each town, were occupied by the members of the tribe in whose land the town lay (comp. Josh. xxi. 12, and Keil on the passage). Reference has also been made in this connection with good reason to the law concerning the sale of Levites' houses, Lev. xxv. 32 f., since this has a meaning only on the presupposition that other Israelites dwelt with the Levites. Accordingly in Bethshemesh, 1 Sam. vi. 13, which was a priests' town, Josh. xxi. 16, we find in fact at a later period inhabitants who are distinguished from the לֵוִיִּם who were in it. It is probable that the latter expression was also used in speaking of members of the priestly family when they were not really installed in the priest's office (see Stähelin, *l.c.* p. 713 f.).

(11) Riehm (*l.c.* p. 33 ff.) says that Deuteronomy distinctly contradicts the provisions in the book of Numbers concerning the dwelling-places of the Levites by presupposing a houseless tribe of Levites, and by representing the Levites as *strangers* living scattered in the various towns of the various tribes. This assertion is at first sight a gross exaggeration, since, with the exception of xviii. 6, the Levites themselves are *not designated as strangers* in any of the passages cited by Riehm (xii. 12, 18; xiv. 27, 29; xvi. 11, 14). In order to appreciate the statements in Deuteronomy rightly, compare also what is said on the situation of the Levites as it was from the beginning of the time of the judges and onward, in the historical section of the "Theology of Prophecy."

2. THE PRIESTHOOD (1).

§ 95.

It appears from what has been already said (§ 92), that the design *of the priestly vocation* is in the first place essentially *to represent the nation as a holy congregation before Jehovah, with full divine authority* (comp. Deut. xviii. 5), and to open up for it access to its God (2). Standing as a holy order between Jehovah and the congregation in its approach to Him, the priests are to cover the latter by the holiness of their office (3), which official holiness (Num. xviii. 1) covers also the guilt which adheres to the person of the priest himself; and in the functions of his office the priest is the medium of the intercourse which takes place in worship between Jehovah and the congregation, and which, on account of the sinfulness of the congregation, becomes a service of atonement. The name כֹּהֵן (and כְּהֻנָּה) probably refers to this priestly calling. The stem כָּהַן appears to be connected with כּוּן (as כָּהַל with כָּוַל, כָּהַר with כּוּר), and to mean either intransitively, "to present oneself," or transitively, *parare, aptare;* in the former case, כֹּהֵן would be one who stands to represent another (4), and in the latter case the priest would be named from the preparing and presenting the sacrifice (5).—Besides this mediatorial calling, the priest has the office of *teacher and interpreter of the law*, Lev. x. 11, in which respect he has to accomplish a divine *mission* to the people; hence the priest is, in Mal. ii. 7, called a מַלְאַךְ יהוה, "for the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and men should seek the law at his mouth." As it is said in Ezek. xliv. 23, the priest shall "teach my people the difference between the holy and profane, between the unclean and the clean" (comp. Lev. x. 10, and the functions described in chap. xiii. f., Hag. ii. 11 ff.); it is further said in Ezekiel, ver. 24: "And in controversy they shall stand in judgment; they shall judge according to my judgments" (6). The two sides of the priestly calling—to teach Israel Jehovah's judgments and law, and to offer incense and sacrifice on His altar—are embraced together, Deut. xxxiii. 10.

The bearers of this priestly dignity are, as has already been remarked, only the *Aaronites;* and this choice of Aaron's house is re-confirmed (Num. xvi.) in consequence of Korah's rebellion, and certified (Num. xvii.) by the sign of the budding *almond-rod*, which indicated that the priesthood does not rest on any natural pre-eminence whatever,—for Aaron's rod had originally nothing more than the others,—but depends only on the divine grace, which fills this office with living energy. But thenceforth the divine calling to the priesthood is connected with the natural propagation of Aaron's family; and as Aaron's two sons, Nadab and Abihu, died because they offered strange fire (Lev. x. 1 f.), and left no sons, it passed to the race of the other two sons of Aaron, *Eleazar and Ithamar* (7).

The holiness of the priesthood was to be reflected in the whole appearance of the priests, which was to suggest the highest purity and exclusive devotion to God. To this refer, in the first place, the provisions as to the *bodily condition and regulation of life* of the priests. The law treats of the bodily condition of the priests in Lev. xxi. 16–24. It declares that all considerable physical blemishes render a man unfit for the priest's office. But though excluded from service, a

person afflicted with such blemishes might (ver. 22) enjoy the sacred gifts given for the support of the priests (as well of the first as of the second order) (8). The provisions for the *regulation of the life* are given in Lev. xxi. 1 ff. In it we are told that the priest shall not defile himself with any dead body, by taking charge of the funeral and sharing in the customs of mourning, *except* in the case of his nearest *blood* relatives, viz., his father, mother, son, daughter, brother, and his sister if she be still a virgin. The same six cases are named in Ezek. xliv. 25 (9). But even in these cases he must avoid every disfigurement of his body. With regard to *marriage*, the law (Lev. xxi. 7 ff.) commands that he shall not marry a harlot, or one who has been deflowered or divorced, but only a virgin or a widow ; which in Ezek. xliv. 22 is limited to "virgins of the seed of Israel, or a widow of a priest" (10). Propriety and order must rule in the priest's family. If a priest's daughter give herself up to lewdness, she shall (Lev. xxi. 9) be burned (without doubt after being stoned). The *dietetic* directions which the law lays down for the priests, are simply that they must avoid the use of wine and other intoxicating liquors at the time of their service in the sanctuary, Lev. x. 9 f., in order to preserve entire clearness of mind for their functions ; and further, that the general prohibition to defile oneself by partaking of what has died of itself, or been torn by beasts, is specially inculcated on them, xxii. 8. If a priest had levitically defiled himself, involuntarily, or in an unavoidable way, he might not eat of the holy food until he was legally cleansed again. Every offence against this rule was threatened with death, xxii. 2 ff. There is no prescription in the law as to the *age* required for entering on the priestly office. It is to be supposed that the rule concerning the age of the Levites held good of the priests also.

The *consecration* of the priests, for which, as has already been mentioned, the expression קִדֵּשׁ (Ex. xxix. 1, xl. 13) is used, is prescribed in Ex. xxix. 1–37, xl. 12–15, and is mentioned in Lev. viii. as performed in the case of Aaron and his sons. The consecration of the priests consists of two classes of acts :—1. Washing, robing, and anointing ; which three acts form the real consecration of the person to the priestly office ; 2. a threefold offering, by which the persons thus consecrated were put into all the functions and rights of the priesthood. The consecration began by leading those who were to be consecrated to the door of the tabernacle, and *washing* them—doubtless their whole body, and not merely their hands and feet. The putting off of the uncleanness of the body is a symbol of spiritual cleansing, without which no one may approach God, and least of all he who conducts the ceremonies of atonement. This negative preparation was followed by the *robing*, which, with the common priests, consists in putting on four articles of dress,—breeches, coat, bonnet, and girdle ; comp. Ex. xxviii. 40–42 (11). The clothes were made of fine, shining white linen, as the symbol of purity ; only the girdle was embroidered with bright colors (woollen garments were forbidden). In the service shoes were not to be worn. Then followed the priestly *anointing*, a symbol of the communication of the Divine Spirit which operates in the priestly office (12). The olive oil employed was mixed with four sweet-smelling substances. According to tradition, we are to think of it as applied only to the forehead, in distinction from the unction of the high priest. This anointing was (Ex. xl. 15) to serve Aaron's sons "for an everlasting

priesthood throughout their generations;" and this has often been understood as if this anointing had not to be repeated afterward in the case of common priests.

The offering which followed, and which of course was not performed by those to be consecrated, but by Moses, comprised a *threefold sacrifice*. First, priests and altar are purified, Lev. viii. 15, by the sin-offering of a young bullock; then the offering of the purified priests to God is completed by the burnt-offering of a ram (13). Thirdly, this is followed by a modified thank-offering (14). This is the specific sacrifice for the consecration of the priests, and bears the name מִלֻּאִים, "filling," Lev. viii. 22, 28 (vii. 37),—an expression which is to be explained by the phrase "filling the *hand*," and which refers to the conveyance of authority to the priest (15). Not only is the altar sprinkled with the blood of the sacrificed ram, as at other thank-offerings, but also the right ear, the right thumb, and the great toe of the right foot of Aaron and his sons are touched with it: the ear, because the priest must at all times hearken to the holy voice of God; the hand, because he must execute God's commands, and especially the priestly functions; the foot, because he must walk rightly and holily. Further, it is peculiar to this offering that Moses takes the fat pieces, the right shoulder of the ram, and some of the three different kinds of cakes belonging to the thank-offering, and lays all these together in the hands of Aaron and his sons, and waves them before Jehovah, after which all is burned. This act signifies, first, the conveyance of the function which belongs to the priest to offer the fat pieces on God's altar; secondly, the investiture of the priest with the gifts, which they receive in future for their service, but which they must now give over to Jehovah, because they are not yet fully consecrated, and therefore cannot yet themselves act as priests (16). The conclusion of the festival is the sacrificial meal. The duration of the consecration is fixed at seven days (Ex. xxix. 15 ff.; Lev. viii. 33 ff.). (During this whole time, those who are to be consecrated were to stay, day and night, in the outer court, at the entrance of the tabernacle.) On each of the six following days a repetition of the sin-offering was to take place (Ex. xxix. 36); it is not said whether the other two offerings and the anointing were to be repeated or not. (Still the repetition of these offerings is probable; for the daily filling of the hands prescribed in Ex. xxix. 35, Lev. viii. 33, took place through the offering of consecration at which the burnt-offering was presupposed.)—The meaning of all these δικαιώματα σαρκός, these outward priestly regulations, and the aim of these teachings, is distinctly expressed by the Old Testament itself in Deut. xxxiii. 9 f.: "Who said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children; for they have observed Thy word, and kept Thy covenant. They shall teach Jacob Thy judgments, and Israel Thy law; they shall put incense before Thee, and whole burnt sacrifice upon Thine altar." The priesthood, indeed, as such, is linked to birthright, and the priestly service demands only outward purity and perfection; but that the *real subjective qualification for the priesthood* lies in undivided devotion to God, which, when His honor is in question, is willing to sacrifice even the highest worldly interest, is distinctly expressed both here and in the calling of the tribe of Levi, Ex. xxxii. 26 ff. (comp. § 29 with note 2). Unbroken obedience is demanded of the priest, Lev. x. 3: "I

will be sanctified in them that come nigh me (קָרַב, designation of the priests), and before all the people I will be honored" (comp. Mal. ii. 5 ff.) (17).

The *maintenance* of the priests was cared for in the following manner:—They received as dwelling-places thirteen of the towns which were given to the Levites, Josh. xxi. 4, 10 ff. (compare the enumeration in 1 Chron. vi. 39 ff., which, however, is not free from corruptions of text); further—compare Num. xviii. 8 ff., the chief passage—the Levites had to give them the tithes of their tithes (18), and they received the gifts of the first-fruits, and certain parts of the offerings, etc. (19). Thus the maintenance of the priests was cared for sufficiently, but by no means abundantly; in comparison with the endowments of the priestly caste in many other ancient nations, the provision for the Levitical priests is very moderate.—The deeper meaning of the declaration, that Jehovah alone is the portion and inheritance of the priests, Num. xviii. 20 (20), and what, therefore, ought to be the deepest ground of priestly thought and life, is expressed, Ps. xvi. 5, in these words: "The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup; Thou maintainest my lot. The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places," etc.

(1) Compare Küper, *Das Priesterthum des A. Bundes*, 1866, and my article, "Priesterthum im A. T.," in Herzog's *R. E.* xii. [also Riehm's art. "Priester" in his *Handwörterbuch*.

(2) *Mediatorship* between God and the people is generally said to constitute the essence of the priesthood; and this is, generally speaking, correct, but it is not an adequate expression of the specific business of the priesthood in distinction from the two other theocratic offices. Mediatorial vocation belongs also to the *king* and the *prophet:* to the king, because he *acts* in the name of Jehovah, and exercises judicial and executive authority in God's state as one invested with His power; to the prophet, because he *speaks* in Jehovah's name, and opens up the divine counsel to the people.

(3) A meaning of the priesthood which appears also in the place assigned to Aaron and his sons in the camp, immediately in front of the sanctuary (Num. iii. 38).

(4) As, according to Firuzabadi (see Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, ii. p. 661), *kahinun* means one, "qui surgit in alieno negotio et operam dat in causa ejus." Comp. Delitzsch on Ps. cx., 4.

(5) *Kahana*, in Arabic, is chiefly used of soothsaying, but it is clear that this meaning is a derived one. On the כֹּהֲנִים, who are found among the king's officers, see my article, "Könige, Königthum in Israel," in Herzog's *R. E.*

(6) Comp. Deut. xvii. 9 ff. See the judicial functions of the priesthood, *infra.*—On its second side, also, the priestly vocation is distinguished from that of the *prophets* by the fact that the priest is bound solely to the interpretation and practice of the law, and does not not receive in the spirit any further knowledge of the divine counsels; to which the Urim and the Thummim of the high priest alone form an exception, if, as some have supposed, he thereby was made acquainted by inspiration with divine decisions. Note how Jer. xviii. 18 ascribes *law* to the priests, *counsel* to the wise, *word* to the prophets; or Ezek. vii. 26, *law* to the priests, *counsel* to the elders, *vision* to the prophets.

(7) While the *prophet*, the *servant* of Jehovah (עֶבֶד), discharges his office in virtue of a free divine call, which is not confined to any tribe, and in virtue of his personal endowment by the Divine Spirit, the *priest*, the *minister* (מְשָׁרֵת) of Jehovah, must prove his personal right to office by his genealogy, although a vital divine power also works in his office. Want of proof of descent from Aaron excluded from the priesthood; an example of which is recorded in Ezra ii. 62, Neh. vii. 64 (comp. Josephus, c. *Ap.* i. 7). [That the later Jerusalem priesthood was descended from the family of Aaron is controverted by Well-

hausen, i. p. 128 f., who appeals to 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff., as showing that Eli's house and father's house, and consequently the family chosen at the establishment of the theocracy, was displaced for another, namely, the family of Zadok (1 K. ii. 27), which therefore was not legitimated by descent. But in the antiquity of the expression "father's house" it cannot be said in v. 31 to indicate necessarily the entire posterity of the father of the stock, who was chosen at the establishment of the theocracy (Comp. Dillmann, *Commentar zu Ex. und Lev.*, p. 460 and 58; see also § 101); and if the passage is, as W. assumes, post-Deuteronomic, it cannot be understood, as Bredenkamp has shown, p. 181, as the former understands it; for "to maintain that the Zadokites or priests of the temple, could have been called in that age upstarts, sprung from a line not Mosaically sanctioned, would be to annihilate their authority."]

(8) It is scarcely needful to remark, that not all Aaronites, even when possessed of the qualifications required by the law, were really priests in office; thus Benaiah, military commandant under David and Solomon (2 Sam. viii. 18, xx. 23; 1 Kings ii. 25), was, 1 Chron. xxvii. 5, a priest's son.

(9) Comp., too, Philo, *de Monarch.* § 12. [What is required of him at the death of his wife cannot be determined with certainty either from Lev. xxi. 4, or from Ezek. xxiv. 16 ff. Comp. Dillmann on Lev. xxi. 4.]

(10) The latter limitation has only a prophetic character (s. Wagenseil, *Sota*, p. 557 f.), while the former is without doubt in the sense of the law, and is followed, Ezra x. 18 f., Neh. xiii. 28 ff.

(11) In 1 Sam. xxii. 18, even the common priests wore an ephod, but of inferior material (בַּד).

(12) Certainly Ex. xxix. 7, Lev. viii. 12, speak only of the anointing of Aaron; but Ex. xxvii. 41, xxx. 30, xl. 15, Lev. vii. 35 f., x. 7, refer distinctly to the anointing of Aaron's sons.

(13 and 14) Comp., further on, the description of the sacrificial worship, § 131 ff.

(15) The phrase מִלֵּא אֶת־יַד פ׳ (Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 9, 29, 33; Lev. viii. 33, xvi. 32; Num. iii. 3; comp. Judg. xvii. 5) does not indicate the bestowal of a gift on the priest by Jehovah, but a conferring or delivering over of the rights of office, authorization (comp. Isa. xxii. 21). On the contrary, if one fills his hand to Jehovah (1 Chron. xxix. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 31; comp. Ex. xxxii. 29), this means, providing oneself with something to offer to Jehovah. [That the expression, as Wellhausen, i. p. 132 f., deems probable, signified originally a filling of the hand with *gold*, and so refers to a paid priesthood in the older time, does not follow from Judges xvii.]

(16) The breast, which was given to Jehovah at the common thank-offerings by waving it, but then relinquished by Him to the priest, falls in the present case to the share of Moses, as acting in the character of priest.—Lastly, Moses sprinkled the priests and their garments with a mixture of anointing oil and blood of the sacrifice (Lev. viii. 30; on the contrary, Ex. xxix. 21 represents this act as taking place immediately after the sprinkling of the altar).

(17) The *official functions* of the priests, in distinction from those of the Levites, Num. xviii. 3, are briefly designated by "coming near to the vessels of the sanctuary and the altar." Their functions in the holy place were—lighting the incense on the golden altar every morning and evening, cleaning and taking charge of the lamps and lighting them toward the evening, arranging the shewbread on the Sabbath; in the court—keeping up the continual fire on the altar of burnt-offering, removing the ashes from the altar, presenting the morning and evening sacrifice (Lev. vi. 1 ff.), pronouncing the blessing on the people after the completion of the daily sacrifice (Num. vi. 23–27), waving the pieces of the sacrifices, sprinkling of blood, and laying upon the altar and kindling all the parts which were offered. It was also, Num. x. 8–10, xxxi. 6, the priest's duty to blow the silver trumpets at festivals and sacrificial ceremonials as well as in campaigns (comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 12). See in the discussion of the new-moon Sabbath, § 150, the meaning of the trumpet-blast, in virtue of which the blowing of the trumpets forms a part of the priestly intercession.

(18) Thus, on the one hand, the higher position of the priests over the Levites is expressed; and on the other hand, an essential portion of the priests' support is made dependent on the conscientiousness of the Levites.

(19) See the particulars in the above-cited article, p. 180 ff., and compare, further on, the discussion of the sacrificial ritual and the theocratic taxes.

(20) In Num. xviii. 20, "Thou shalt have no inheritance in their land, neither shalt thou have any part among them: I am thy part and thine inheritance among the children of Israel," was said to Aaron; comp. Deut. x. 9, xviii. 1 f. (Ezek. xliv. 28).

3. THE HIGH PRIEST (1).

§ 96.

The name of the *high priest* is הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל, Num. xxxv. 28, or הַכֹּהֵן חַמָּשִׁיחַ, Lev. iv. 3, 5, 16; the most complete expression is in xxi. 10, "The priest who is higher than his brethren, upon whose head the anointing oil was poured;" he is also called the priest by way of distinction, *e.g.* Deut. xvii. 12 (2). In the high-priesthood are united the mediatorship by which the people are represented before God, and the official priestly sanctity by which they are reconciled. If God in the blood of an offering accepts the life of a clean animal by which the people's sin and uncleanness is covered (according to the original meaning of כִּפֶּר), in the high-priesthood, on the contrary, a man is elected and sanctified by God that he may in virtue of his holiness appear before Him for the people, and, as is said in the important passage Ex. xxviii. 38, bear the iniquity of the holy things [*i.e.* atone for the holy things regarded as in a state not accepted of God] which the children of Israel hallow in all their holy gifts, that they may be accepted before Jehovah. Thus the whole reconciling and sanctifying effect of the sacrifices is dependent on the existence of a personally reconciling mediatorship before God (3); and here the old covenant proclaims its inadequacy to effect a true reconciliation, in the fact that even the high priest himself, through whose intercession the defect which attaches to the offering is made good, himself in turn has need of reconciliation and purification by the blood of sacrifices, as one subject to sin and weakness (comp. Heb. v. 3). As the representative of the whole nation, the high priest bears on his shoulder and on his heart the names of the tribes of the people, Ex. xxviii. 12, 29. (Particulars on this passage below.) The same expiatory sacrifice is demanded for his person as for all the people, because he unites in his person the significance of the whole people (4) (comp. the ritual of sacrifice). When he in whose person the people stand before Jehovah commits an error, this, as is said in Lev. iv. 3, operates לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם [so as to bring guilt on the people]; that is, it causes a disturbance of the theocratic order, which requires to be atoned for, and is imputed to the whole people. When, on the contrary, God acknowledges a high priest as well-pleasing in His sight, this is a declaration in fact that He graciously accepts the whole people (5).

This significance of the high priest, in virtue of which he is the קְדוֹשׁ יְהוָה κ. ἐξ. (comp. Ps. cvi. 16), must be stamped on his whole appearance, which is to awaken to a still higher degree than that of the common priests, an impression of the highest purity and of exclusive devotion to God. To this end are directed, in the first place, the regulations in regard to his personal condition and mode of

life. In respect to descent and bodily constitution, the law prescribes nothing in which the high priest is to be different from the other priests (comp. § 95). On the other hand, the rules in Lev. xxi. 10–15, in regard to the ordering of his life, relate exclusively to the high priest. According to these, he who specially reflects the whole fulness of a holy life must have no polluting fellowship with death, and not even come in contact (ver. 11) with the corpses of his parents; his priestly administration in the sanctuary may not be interrupted by any consideration whatever of the bonds of nature, otherwise regarded as most holy. Even every sign of mourning is denied him (6). With regard to the marriage of the high priest, the prohibition to marry a widow is added to the marriage restrictions relating to the common priests. He must marry a pure virgin (ver. 13 f.).

Further, the high priest's *consecration to his office* differed from that of the common priests (comp. § 95) with reference to the *robing* and *anointing*. On the former, see Ex. xxix. 5–9, Num. xx. 26–28 (7). Without the ornaments of his order, the high priest is simply a private individual, who, as such, cannot intercede for the people; therefore he is threatened with death if he appear before Jehovah without them. The description of the high priest's official garments is given in Ex. xxviii. and xxxix., with which Sir. xlv. 8–13; Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 7. 4 ff., *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 7, are to be compared (8). Over the ordinary priest's dress the high priest wore, first, the מְעִיל (LXX ποδήρης), a woven upper dress of blue cotton, which is to be supposed, from the description we have of it, to be not in the style of a mantle, but a close dress, with a laced opening for the neck and (according to Josephus and the Rabbins) armholes (not sleeves), so that the white sleeves of the under dress were seen. It was trimmed on the under hem with a fringe, on which were alternately pomegranates of cotton and golden bells; Rabbinical tradition says there were seventy-two of the latter. These served to signal to the people gathered in the court the entrance and performances of the high priest, Ex. xxviii. 35; they could thus follow him with their thoughts and prayers (9). Over the Meïl was the ephod, אֵפוֹד, and to this the breastplate, חֹשֶׁן, with the Urim and the Thummim, was fastened by chains and ribbons. The covering of the head was a mitre, מִצְנֶפֶת. On the front of it was a plate of gold, צִיץ, called in Ex. xxix. 6 נֵזֶר, that is, a diadem, with the inscription קדש ליהוה. For his duties on the yearly day of atonement another dress of office, made of white linen, was prescribed (comp. *infra*, § 140, on the day of atonement).

This dress of office has received very various symbolic interpretations. These go back even to Philo, *de Monarch.* ii. 5 f., who referred it to cosmical relations, in conformity with his view of the Mosaic worship. Among more modern writers, Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 97 ff.) has entered into the particulars of the matter. Proceeding from the position that the high priest, as mediator of the theocratic people, unites in himself its three theocratic dignities (comp. *Pirke Aboth* iv. 13),—that of the priesthood, the law, and kingship,—he finds that those garments of the high priest which he had in common with the other priests express the priestly character; the Meïl, that of the covenant; the ephod and hhoshen, that of a king. But the whole assumption on which this interpretation rests is incorrect. The Old Testament knows nothing of a royal dignity, for the present, belonging to the high priest; it awaits the union of the two dignities in the Messiah

(Ps. cx. 4; Zech. vi. 13). Even for the high priest, only the *two* sides of the priestly calling appear (comp. Deut. xxxiii. 10) which were treated of in § 95; and so also, in Sir. xlv. 16 f., a twofold office is ascribed to the high priest,—the ἐξιλάσκεσθαι περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ by sacrifice, and the ἐξουσία ἐν διαθήκαις κριμάτων διδάξαι τὸν Ἰακὼβ τὰ μαρτύρια, κ.τ.λ. (to have power over the ordinances of justice, that He may teach Jacob the precepts, and enlighten Israel in His law). Thus the high priest's dress can have a symbolic meaning only in the two directions which have been mentioned, and this is unmistakably proved in its main part, the ephod and the breastplate (10). The power to give divine decisions to the people is expressed in the Urim and the Thummim (on these see § 97). The reference to the reconciling mediatorship, as has already been indicated, is especially marked by the fact that the high priest, when clothed with the ephod, bears the names of the twelve tribes on his *heart* and shoulders. As the heart (comp. § 71) is the focus of the personal life, bearing them on the heart denotes personal interpenetration of his life and theirs, in virtue of which the high priest has the most lively sympathy with those for whom he intercedes (11). That the ephod is essentially a *shoulder*-piece (LXX ἐπωμίς) does not make it a symbol of kingly power; what, generally speaking, lies in this, is only that the dignity of office *rests on him.* When it is said in Ex. xxviii. 12 that the names of the twelve tribes were engraved on the onyx-stones by means of which the shoulder-pieces were fastened together, this certainly does not denote (as v. Gerlach also explains the passage) that the high priest is the people's regent, but it is meant to signify that He as Mediator, carries, as it were, the people to God—that, so to speak, the people (comp. the term in Num. xi. 11) lie as a burden on him.

The robing of the high priest is followed by his *unction.* The peculiarity of the unction of the high priest is designated by the expression יֶצֶק עַל־רֹאשׁ (Ex. xxix. 7; Lev. viii. 12., xxi. 10), which implies that the anointing oil is poured on him in rich abundance (comp. Ps. cxxxiii. 2). From his unction, the high priest was called (as remarked above) κ. ἐξ., "the anointed priest."

Lastly, with reference to the high priest's *functions*, it is first to be noted that all the functions of the common priests fell also on him. The law does not distinguish any services which fell exclusively on the latter class. Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 7) says that the high priest's functions were limited to the Sabbath, the new moons, and festivals; but in *Mishna Thamid*, vii. 3, it is presupposed that he might, at his pleasure, take part in the sacrificial services. Secondly, the service on the day of atonement, and the Urim and Thummim, were specially assigned to the high priest (comp. § 140 f.). On his share in the administration of justice, see below.—It is further to be noted, that the whole sacrificial service forms a self-contained unity, and that the same is true of the priesthood. When the subordinate priests officiate at the service of the sacrifice, they do not act as single persons, but by the authority which is bestowed on the whole priesthood, and concentrated in the high priest; and thus they really act in the place of the high priest. Hence it corresponds entirely with the Mosaic view of the priesthood, that Sir. xlv. 14, 16 (17, 20) designates the service of the altar simply as the service of *Aaron.*

(1) Comp. my article "Hoherpriester," in Herzog's *R.E.* [with additions in the 2d ed. by Delitzsch].

(2) In the passages which treat of the high-priesthood in the middle books of the Pentateuch, Aaron, the first bearer of the office, is generally named instead of the office itself.—כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ appears only in the later style, in 2 Kings xxv. 18, Ezra vii. 5, 2 Chron. xix. 11, comp. xxiv. 6.—The LXX generally write *ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας*,—Lev. iv. 3, *ἀρχιερεύς*, and generally so in the New Testament, in Philo, and Josephus.—On the *ἀρχιερεῖς* in the N. T., see Delitzsch in the above-cited article, p. 238.

(3) Comp. Calvin's good exposition of Ex. xxviii. 38 : "Oblationum sanctarum iniquitas tollenda et purganda fuit per sacerdotem. Frigidum est illud commentum, si quid erroris admissum esset in ceremoniis, remissum fuisse sacerdotis precibus. Longius enim respicere nos oportet : ideo oblationum iniquitatem deleri a sacerdote, quia nulla oblatio, quatenus est hominis, omni vitio caret. Dictu hoc asperum est et fere *παράδοξον*, sanctitates ipsas esse immundas, ut venia indigeant ; sed tenendum est, nihil esse tam purum, quod non aliquid labis a nobis contrahat.—Nihil Dei cultu præstantius : et tamen nihil offerre potuit populus etiam a lege præscriptum, nisi intercedente venia, quam nonnisi per sacerdotem obtinuit."

(4) שקול כנגד כל-ישראל, "æquiparatur universo Israëli," says Aben Esra on Lev. iv. 13. Compare, in particular, Bähr, *Symbol. des mos. Kultus*, 1st ed. ii. p. 13 f.

(5) Zech. iii. must be explained from this point of view (comp. § 200).

(6) The words (Lev. xxi. 12), "He shall not go out of the sanctuary," must be supplemented according to the context, *funeris causa ;* x. 7 serves for explanation.—The expression in xxi. 10, "he shall not uncover his head," refers, probably, to the removing of the head-dress in order to sprinkle the head with dust and ashes ; see Hävernick on Ezek. xxiv. 17. But Knobel [and Dillmann] understand פָּרַע to mean, leaving the hair loose or flying. Compare on this, and the command not to rend his clothes, the above-cited article, p. 199 f.

(7) The transference of the office of high priest from Aaron to Eleazar took place (Num. xx. 26–28) by the transference of the ornaments of office.

(8) The most valuable monographs on this topic are : Braun, *De vestitu sacerdotum hebræorum*, 1680 ; Carpzov, *De pontificum hebræorum vestitu sacro*, in Ugolino's *Thes.* xii. ; Abraham ben David, *Dissert. de vestitu sacerdotum hebræorum*, in Ugolino, xiii.

(9) Compare, also Sir. xlv. 9. The passage Ex. xxviii. 35 was formerly misunderstood, chiefly because it was thought needful closely to connect the words וְלֹא יָמוּת with what precedes them ; see the genuinely Rabbinical explanation in Abraham ben David, *l.c.* p. xx. f.

(10) The term מְעִיל הָאֵפוֹד, used in Ex. xxviii. 31, shows that the Meïl has no independent importance. [Above-cited article.]

(11) Comp. Cant. viii. 6 ; 2 Cor. vii. 3 ; Phil. i. 7.—The plerosis of the above provision in the Epistle to the Hebrews is familiar.

II. THE THEOCRATIC AUTHORITY.

1. THE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY.

§ 97.

In virtue of the principles of the theocracy, *all the powers of the state are united* (§ 91) *in Jehovah ;* even when the congregation acts, it is in His name. He is first the *Lawgiver*, מְחֹקֵק (Isa. xxxiii. 22). His legislative power He exercised *through Moses.* The fundamental law given through him is inviolably valid for all time. As God's covenant with His people is eternal, so also are the covenant

ordinances; they are, as the expression frequently runs, everlasting laws and statutes for Israel and the future generations (see Ex. xii. 14, 17, xxvii. 21, xxviii. 43, and many passages). The Pentateuch knows nothing of a future change in the law, nor of an abrogation of it even in part; only the *attitude of the people toward the law* was to be different in the last times (see § 90). But, on the other hand, in the development of the theocracy, the need of receiving an immediate proclamation of Jehovah's kingly will must always reappear. This need was met by the Urim and Thummin, through which the high priest, in whose breastplate they were set, received the decision of Jehovah (Num. xxvii. 21); and this is why the breastplate bears the name חֹשֶׁן הַמִּשְׁפָּט [the breastplate of judgment] (Ex. xxviii. 30). It probably bore some resemblance to the figure made of precious stones, which Diodorus (*Biblioth.* i. 48, 75) and Ælian (*Var. hist.* xiv. 34) say the Egyptian high priest wore round his neck, and which bore the name of truth (ἀλήθεια), as indeed the Urim and Thummin are translated by the LXX by δήλωσις καὶ ἀλήθεια. The term אוּרִים refers to the divine illumination, the תֻּמִּים to the unimpeachable correctness of the divine decision; comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 41. It cannot be determined from the Old Testament *how the decision took place.* It is not quite clear from the expression (Ex. xxviii. 30; Lev. viii. 8), "put the Urim and Thummim in the breastplate of judgment," that the Urim and Thummim were something different from the precious stones which were set in the breastplate; for the expression may stand in a sense similar to the phrase, to lay a curse or blessing on anything. But if the Urim and Thummin are really spoken of in 1 Sam. xiv. 41 f., as must be admitted, if we adopt the fuller text of the LXX (with Thenius and other modern writers), they must be regarded as a *holy lot*, different from the gems of the breastplate, and probably fastened to it, but capable of being taken off and cast (1). But, on the other hand, it is to be noted that the term הִפִּיל, to *cast* or *throw*, is nowhere else used of the Urim and Thummim. Since every part of the high priest's dress is described so accurately, we should expect to have a more particular description of the Urim and Thummim if they were anything distinct. According to Josephus, the divine answer came by the sparkling of the jewels; even the Rabbinical tradition, though it is so divided on points of detail, is almost unanimous in declaring that the revelation was made by the illumination of particular letters of the writing on the jewels. But several late writers, and especially Bähr (*l.c.* ii. p. 135 ff.), think, that when the high priest laid the matter in question before God in prayer, the decision followed by *inspiration;* and "that the pledge that an answer should be given him which should be in accordance with God's will, and serve for the good of the people, was worn on his heart in the Urim and Thummim." Similarly Hengstenberg (*Hist. of the Kingdom of God*, 2 Per. p. 148 f.). Thus the Urim and Thummim, whether similar to the precious stones of the breastplate or different from them, would have had simply the character of symbols and pledges. There are no satisfactory grounds for this view of Bähr's, and we must decline to accept it.—Tradition says that it was not permitted to consult the oracle on private concerns and on matters of small moment, but only in such cases as concerned the welfare of the whole people (comp. Judg. xx. 27 f.). 1 Sam. xxiii. 9 ff., xxx. 7 f., agree with this, for David stands before the high priest here as the one who is called to the kingship. After David there is no occasion on which this

oracle is consulted, and the Urim and Thummim seem to have fallen more and more into disuse—displaced, probably, by prophecy. Josephus, indeed, says (*Ant.* iii. 8. 9) that the oracle ceased only two hundred years before his time; but this contradicts the passage in Ezra ii. 63, where we read that there had been no oracle since the exile; and with this Jewish tradition agrees.

The *sacred lot* seems to have been different from the Urim and Thummim. It was employed (Num. xxvi. 55 f.; Josh. xiv.) at the division of the tribal territories, to discover the guilty one who had brought a curse on the people (Josh. vii. 14 ff.), and in 1 Sam. xiv. 41 (unless the Urim and Thummim are there meant) and 1 Sam. x. 20 f., at the king's election. The lot must also have been used to decide priestly {?} controversies; compare Prov. xviii. 18.—These methods of inquiring into the divine will retire into the background the more *prophecy* becomes prominent. We read in Deut. xviii. 19 ff., how Moses, before parting from the people, led them to look for the sending forth of new organs of revelation. The people who stand in covenant with the living God shall not be left to a helplessness which might be the occasion of seeking disclosures from the heathen divination, so stringently prohibited in all its forms (2). And as the people could not bear the terror of an immediate revelation from God, Jehovah will hold communion with them through *men*, raising up again and again from the midst of the people such men as Moses, in whose mouth He puts His words. These are the prophets, the נְבִיאִים (3).

(1) 1 Sam. xiv. 41, the inquiring into the divine will by Saul: "God of Israel, give תָּמִּים,"—give a pure, true utterance. Ver. 42: "Draw lots between me and Jonathan."—I believe, with Keil, that another sacred lot is here spoken of.

(2) Comp. Num. xxiii. 23: "Surely there is no enchantment in Jacob, neither is there any divination in Israel; in due time it is told of Jacob and Israel what God doeth." See Hengstenberg on the passage.

(3) The Prophetic Theology further on is connected with this point.

2. THE JUDICIAL POWER (1).

§ 98.

The Principle and Organization of the Administration of Justice.

The *administration of justice* is, in virtue of the principles of theocracy, *only an efflux of the divine judgment.* "The judgment is God's," Deut. i. 17; to seek justice is to inquire of God, Ex. xviii. 15; he who appears in judgment comes before Jehovah, Deut. xix. 17; and thus also the expressions, הַנִּגַּשׁ אֶל-הָאֱלֹהִים, Ex. xxi. 6, and בּוֹא עַד הָאֱלֹהִים, xxii. 8, are to be explained, whether it be that these expressions point to the God who rules in the administration of justice (comp. also xviii. 19), or that the judge himself is called Elohim, as the one who takes the place of God (comp. Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6, but not Ex. xxii. 27, where אֱלֹהִים designates God; comp. § 86). The theocratic ordinances of judgment limit also the power of the head of a family, by taking from him (Deut. xxi. 18 ff.; Ex. xxi. 20) the power over the life and death of those belonging to him, which he still exercised (comp. Gen. xxxviii. 24) in the time of the patriarchs. Lynch

law is also forbidden, because the office of avenger is God's alone, Lev. xix. 18. The old custom of *blood revenge* is indeed retained, but it is subjected to theocratic regulations.

With regard to the *organization of the courts of justice*, we must distinguish in the Pentateuch the *provisions given only for the march through the wilderness*, and *the regulations in Deuteronomy, which had reference to later circumstances.*—Moses, who at the beginning united in his person all the theocratic offices, was also the first judge, Ex. xviii. 13 ff. As he was unable alone to meet the cares of justice, he set judges over the people,—over thousands, over hundreds, over fifties, and over tens, at Jethro's advice, ver. 25 f. ; Deut. i. 12 ff. At the nomination of the judges, which was supported by the choice of the people (Deut. i. 13, "Take you"), the moral and intellectual qualities of those nominated were chiefly taken into account, Ex. xviii. 21, Deut. i. 13, 15 ; still it is probable that Moses (comp. Deut. i. 5, "I took the chiefs of your tribes") was guided by the constitution of the tribes then existing among the people, and at the same time by regard to the military division of the people, which was necessary during the march through the wilderness (comp. Num. xxxi. 14, where there is mention of military captains over thousands and over hundreds).—We are not to think of appellate courts in connection with the relation of these judges to one another. The subordinate judges are to decide minor matters, while the more difficult cases are brought before Moses, to whom they are referred not by the disputing parties, but by the subordinate judges who find the matter too difficult for them, Deut. i. 17 f. (Ex. xviii. 22, 26) ; upon which Moses brings it before Jehovah ; comp. Ex. xviii. 19, and the examples in Lev. xxiv. 11 ff., Num. xv. 33 ff., xxvii. 2 ff.

Deuteronomy lays down *new regulations for the time of the approaching settlement of the people in the land* (the explanation of which has some difficulties). The administration of justice is placed in the hands of the congregation ; for the nation that is sanctified to God has, as such, the calling "to put away the evil from among it" which is the ever-recurring formula ; see passages like Deut. xiii. 6, xvii. 7, xxi. 21, etc., compared with earlier ones, Lev. xxiv. 14, Num. xv. 35. —A very vivid description of the way in which courts were held in Israel is given in later times by the story of the judgment of Naboth, 1 Kings xxi.—Hence the administration is to be exercised publicly, at the open places before the gates, Deut. xxi. 19, xxiii. 15, xxv. 7. The community exercises its judicial power by special judges, who are to be placed in all the gates, Deut. xvi. 18 (who decide "if there be a quarrel between men," xxv. 1). These are different—see Deut. xxi. 2, comp. Josh. viii. 33 (xxiii. 2)—from the זְקֵנִים, but probably are, as a rule, taken from them. The college of the זְקֵנִים itself acts only in cases of law, where the question is no longer one of judicial inquiry, but of judicial interposition in a matter already plain ; Deut. xix. 12, xxi. 19, xxii. 15, xxv. 8 (2). A higher tribunal is ordained for more difficult cases, Deut. xvii. 8 ff. It is to judge "between blood and blood (*i.e.* where it is doubtful under which category (comp. Ex. xxi. 12 ff.) manslaughter is to be placed) ; between strife and strife (דִּין, without doubt as designation of the *causæ civiles*) ; between injury and injury" (נֶגַע here, and in xxi. 5, no doubt denotes bodily injuries). Here also the court is not a court of appeal, but has to decide cases in which the local courts do not venture to decide. The seat of this higher court was to be at the sanctuary ; it

was to be composed of priests, who (Lev. x. 11) were to give a decision out of the law (as in Num. xv. 33, xxvii. 2, we find that the high priest took a part in the administration of justice), and a civil judge who had other judges at his side, Deut. xix. 17.—The שֹׁטְרִים appear as officers subordinate to the judges (and are mentioned as early as the residence in Egypt, as the overseers of the people, comp. § 26), Deut. i. 15, xvi. 18 (comp. Josh. viii. 33; 1 Chron. xxiii. 4, etc.). These, as their name denotes, were "writers," from which arose very multifarious employments. In the highest college of 70 elders, there were Shôterîm, Num. xi. 16. They had to act in selecting men for war service, Deut. xx. 5, 8, 9; and many other duties of police and administration may have been added to this.

(1) For the literature, compare Schnell's valuable little monograph, *Das israelitische Recht in seinen Grundzügen dargestellt*, Basel, 1853. The chief work on this topic is the book by Saalschütz, *Das mosaische Recht*, two parts, 1846–48, 2d ed. 1853. See also my article, "Gericht und Gerichtsverwaltung bei den Hebräern," in Herzog's *R.E.* vol. v. [also Riehm, art. "Gerichtswesen," in his *Handwörterbuch*].

(2) See Schultz on Deut. xvi. 18, etc.

§ 99.

The Course of Justice and Punishment.

The course of justice is very simple (1). The complaint is brought before the judges by *word of mouth*, either by the parties, Deut. xxi. 20, xxii. 16, or by others bringing both parties in the dispute into court, xxv. 1. The parties must both appear in person before the judge. The accused person who does not appear is sent for by the judge, xxv. 8. The business of the judge is, it is declared, to hear and thoroughly investigate. The law (as Schnell rightly observes) accumulates expressions (comp. *e.g.* xiii. 14) "to represent the thoroughness and whole compass of the work of the judge, in its earnestness, penetration, and patience."—In some circumstances a simple exhibition of the article (Ex. xxii. 12 (13)) serves as *evidence;* Deut. xxii. 15 is an example of such evidence. A different case is when parents complain against a disobedient son (xxi. 18 ff.). Here the complaint itself is proof (2).—But the testimony *of witnesses* is the most usual form of evidence. Special emphasis is laid upon this. It is enacted that *two* or *three* (3) witnesses shall be brought, xix. 15, particularly in criminal cases, Num. xxxv. 30; Deut. xvii. 6. If the punishment of death be pronounced, the hand of the witnesses must be the first lifted against the person to be punished, Deut. xiii. 10, xvii. 7. All the witnesses (Lev. xxiv. 14) lay their hands on the head of him who is to be stoned. He who was convicted of false witness was condemned to the same punishment as the accused person would have received, Deut. xix. 19. —Further, the *oath* also is a means of evidence. It occurs as an *oath of purgation; e.g.* for theft, Ex. xxii. 6–10, comp. with 1 Kings viii. 31 f. Lev. v. 1 is often quoted for the use of the oath in evidence; but what is there spoken of is not the administration of an oath to the witnesses with respect to what they utter, but a solemn adjuration of those present, by which those who have knowledge of the matter are called on to come forward as witnesses; comp. Prov. xxix. 24. Lastly,

we have to add the adjuration of a wife who was accused of adultery, which called forth an immediate judgment from God, Num. v. 11 ff. The Mosaic legislation does not recognize torture as a means of evidence.—The form of the sentence of judgment is not laid down. As a rule, execution immediately followed on condemnation, Num. xv. 36; Deut. xxii. 18, xxv. 2.

The Mosaic *principle of punishment* is the *jus talionis*, as it is repeatedly expressed in the sentence, "Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth," etc., Ex. xxi. 23–25; Lev. xxiv. 18 ff.; Deut. xix. 21: it shall be done to him who has offended as he has done; in other words, the punishment is a retribution corresponding in quantity and quality to the wicked deed. But that the *talio* is not meant to be understood in a merely external sense is not only shown by various provisions of punishment, but by the fact that not simply the deed itself, but the guilt lying at the root of the deed, is often taken into account in determining the punishment. The *punishment of death* is attached apparently to a large number of crimes. It is prescribed not only for the crime of murder, maltreatment of parents, man-stealing (Ex. xxi. 12 ff.), adultery, incest and other unnatural crimes, idolatry, and the practice of heathen divination and witchcraft (Lev. xx. Deut. xiii. 6 ff.), but for overstepping certain fundamental ordinances of the theocracy, —the law of circumcision, Gen. xvii. 14; the law of the passover, Ex. xii. 15,19; the Sabbath law, xxxi. 14 f.; the pollution of sacrifices, Lev. vii. 20 ff.; sacrificing at other places than the sanctuary, xvii. 8 f.; certain laws of purification, xxii. 3, Num. xix. 13, 20. Yet the peculiar expression, "to be cut off from his people" (וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מֵעַמֶּיהָ), is chosen for the punishment of transgressions of the latter class in distinction from the former,—an expression which, indeed, cannot refer to simple banishment (as some have interpreted it), but still, in some cases, seems to point to a punishment to be executed not by human judgment, but by the divine power; comp. what is said in Lev. xvii. 10 with reference to the person who eats blood: "I will blot out that person" (וְהִכְרַתִּי). When the punishment was really to be executed by human judgment, the term מוֹת יוּמַת [he shall be put to death], is used—as of the violation of the Sabbath law, Ex. xxxi. 14, and in the passages of the former kind, Ex. xxi. 12 ff., Lev. xx., etc. In general, in all cases where the people did not execute judgment on the transgressor, Jehovah Himself reserves the exercise of justice to Himself; see, as main passage, Lev. xx. 4–6.—In the Mosaic law, *corporal chastisement* (stripes) appears as another form of punishment, Deut. xxv. 2 f., also fines, *e.g.* Ex. xxi. 22, Lev. xxiv. 18, etc. The *jus talionis* was to be recognized in case of bodily injury, Ex. xxi. 23–25; Lev. xxiv. 19 f.; Deut. xix. 21. But while this was the principle announced, we may suppose that a proportionate money fine generally took the place of bodily punishment. Further, there occurs the judicial *selling of a guilty person.* The Pentateuch, on the contrary, gives no information of *imprisonment* as a punishment except among the Egyptians (Gen. xxxix. ff.), and the Mosaic law does not recognize it (though certainly at a later time this punishment occurs in Israel also); in Lev. xxiv. 12, imprisonment is only used to secure the man for the time.—With what emphasis the law demands the strict and impartial administration of justice, especially with reference to the poor, see Ex. xxiii. 6–8, Lev. xix. 15, Deut. i. 16 f., and other passages (12).

(1) I follow closely Schnell's excellent discussion, *l.c.* p. 10 ff. The treatment of these topics is a matter for lawyers, and it is to be regretted that the Mosaic law has not received more attention from them.

(2) In Deut. xxi. 18 ff., it is ordained that, if the chastisement inflicted on a reckless, stubborn son is without result, he shall be brought by the parents before the court of the town, and be put to death by sentence of the judge.—Schnell continues, *l.c.* p. 11: "If the hearts of the father and of the mother consent to deliver their child to the judge before the congregation of the people, the utmost is done that the judges need to know."

(3) This point is excellently discussed in *Göttliches Recht und menschliche Satzung*, Basel, 1839: "There are witnesses of God, and faithful witnesses; and there are witnesses who cannot show the truth, and witnesses who must be put to shame. Therefore the judges are permitted and ordered to consider, besides those things which come before their eyes, other points which may decide whether they shall require the evidence of two or of three witnesses."

3. THE EXECUTIVE POWER.

§ 100.

The Mosaic theocracy presents the peculiar phenomenon of being originally unprovided with a definite office for *executing* the power of the state. The princes of the tribes (נְשִׂיאִים), spoken of in Num. i. 16, 44, vii. 2, Ex. xxxiv. 31, and elsewhere (called also "heads of the tribes" (רָאשִׁים) Num. xxx. 2; Deut. v. 20) form no theocratic body (1). They are taken from the זְקֵנִים, who arose, doubtless, from the heads of clans and families (2). The latter had, indeed, a judicial position, but they appear mainly as representatives of the people (קְרִיאֵי הָעֵדָה, Num. i. 16, comp. with xvi. 2), not of Jehovah. That they were appointed for certain services always rests on a special nomination. Thus the committee of the Seventy was formed, who (Num. xi. 16 ff.) were to stand by Moses' side in leading the people, but who appear to have existed only for the time of the march through the wilderness, though the Talmud derives the origin of the Sanhedrim from them. In the same way, twelve chiefs were deputed to spy out the Holy Land (Num. xiii. 2 ff.), and twelve princes were made the committee formed for dividing the land, xxxiv. 18 ff. But all this constitutes no permanent executive. Jehovah Himself acts, as circumstances demand, in the immediate exercise of power, in order to execute His kingly will and to maintain the covenant law; but for the rest, only the assurance is expressed (Num. xxvii. 16 f.) that Jehovah will not leave His congregation as a flock without a shepherd, but will always, again and again, appoint a leader over them and endow him with His Spirit, as He raised up Joshua in Moses' stead, and afterward the Judges.—This want of a regular executive in the Mosaic constitution has been thought very remarkable (3). It has been thought inconceivable that Moses did so little for the execution of his detailed legislation—that he did not see that without a supreme authority no state could possibly exist. It is said that this is a strong proof that the whole Mosaic state, as it is laid before us in the Pentateuch, is only an historical abstraction. But the theocratic constitution does not rest on the calculations of a clever founder of a religion, but on the stability of the counsel of revelation, which is certain of its realization (in spite of the apparent inadequacy of the earthly insti-

tution) ; that defect is simply a proof of the strength and self-confidence of the theocratic principle. Moreover, the whole history of the people in the time of the Judges is to be understood only on the presupposition that there was no established executive power in the state.

Yet Deuteronomy, in *the law concerning a king*, in chap. xvii. 14–20, leaves open the possibility of setting up an earthly kingship. The actual existence of this office in the future is afterward presupposed in xxviii. 36 (comp. moreover, the previous prophecy in Gen. xvii. 6, 16, xxxv. 11 ; Num. xxiv. 17). This future kingship is, however, subjected strictly to the theocratic principle. The people shall only set over them as king *one whom Jehovah shall choose out of their midst.* The kingly dignity shall indeed be confined to Israelites by descent, but not to any particular privileged family (like the priesthood) ; while, at the same time, it is not conferred by the free choice of the people (as the Edomites, for example, Gen. xxxvi. 31–39, must have had such an elective kingship). The chosen king shall "not keep many horses"—that is, he is not to defend his kingdom by a standing army (comp. Isa. xxxi. 1) ; he shall likewise avoid luxury and the keeping of many wives. He is, further, not to regard himself as the people's lawgiver, but shall take the divine law as his strict rule, "that his heart may not be lifted up above his brethren, and that he may not deviate from the command, either to the right hand or the left" (4). The stability of his kingship and its descent to his children are to depend on his obedience to the law.—It cannot be denied that the law relating to the king in Deuteronomy, inasmuch as it claims to be regarded as Mosaic, is a little remarkable ; and what is remarkable in it is not that Moses contemplated in general the institution of an earthly kingship, for sufficient occasion for this is contained in the political constitution of, "all the nations around" (Deut. xvii. 14) ; but the main difficulty is that, not to speak of the example of Gideon (Judg. viii. 23), there is no express reference to a pre-existing Mosaic law relating to the king when Samuel set up the kingdom (though the proceeding then was quite in the spirit of the law), but the royal authority was first established by Samuel, and then (1 Sam. x. 25) recorded in the book which is before Jehovah, that is, the book of the law.

Hence, in connection with the supposition that the law in Deuteronomy is of more recent origin, many modern theologians regard the law concerning the king as a later production, formed on the model of the provisions sketched by Samuel, with reference to the unhappy experiences of the time of Solomon (5) ; but this makes it difficult to explain why a later writer could give as the reason of the law forbidding to keep horses (Deut. xvii. 16), that the people must not be brought back again to Egypt (6).

(1) [Comp. the art. "Aelteste bei den Israeliten," by F. W. Schultz, in Herzog, and by Riehm in his *Handwörterbuch.*]

(2) The elders were not appointed by free choice, as Winer, in his *Bibl. Real-Wörterbuch*, 3d ed. i. p. 50, and Kurtz, *History of the Old Covenant*, ii. p. 169, have supposed, holding the view that the elders form in a certain sense the personal nobility, or nobility of merit, in distinction from the nobility of birth, the princes of the tribes. See the proof for the view in the text in my article "Stämme Israels," in Herzog's *R.E.*

(3) Comp. Vatke, *Religion des A. T.* p. 207 f. [Also, Wellhausen, i. p. 428.]

(4) There cannot be a stronger contrast to Oriental despotism.

(5) Comp. Riehm, *die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 81 ff., and against him Keil, in Hävernick's *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, p. 349 f.

(6) Riehm, *l.c.* p. 100, says the passage points to a time when the Egyptians were in want of soldiers, so that the king of Israel could only get horses from Egypt on the condition of sending Israelitish foot-soldiers there and putting them at the disposal of the king of Egypt. This is supposed to apply to the time of Psammetichus. This hypothesis has no support in the Old Testament.—The words only suit a time in which the stay in Egypt was still fresh in the people's memory, and so, in the hard struggles that they had to encounter, could re-awaken a desire toward the habitation they had quitted. (Comp. Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 202 f.)

III. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FAMILY, AND THE LEGAL PROVISIONS CONNECTED THEREWITH.

§ 101.

The Subdivisions of the Tribes. The Principles and Division of Mosaic Family Law.

The tribes are naturally divided into *clans* (מִשְׁפָּחוֹת, LXX δῆμοι, or אֲלָפִים) (1); these into families or houses (בָּתִּים, οἶκοι), generally called *fathers' houses* (בֵּית אָבוֹת); then follow the various *householders* (גְּבָרִים), with those that belong to them. See the most distinct passage, Josh. vii. 14, 17 f., and also especially Num. i. 2, 18, also Ex. vi. 14. The term בֵּית אָבוֹת, "father's houses" (not "fathers' house," as Clericus and others have understood it), is to be regarded as a plural of the less common singular, בֵּית אָב (2). Beside this meaning of בֵּית אָב, which is unquestionable, from the already-cited passages and others, such as 1 Chron. vii. 7, 40, there is another sense of the word, which is, however, disputed. On the one view, *father's house* is a relative idea of general application, like our "family" or "house;" designating a community which has a common father, it may, it is said, designate whole tribes (Num. xvii. 17; Josh. xxii. 14), and also may stand for a מִשְׁפָּחָה (3); comp. Num. iii. 24, 30, 35, and other passages. On the other view, בֵּית אָב, in passages of this sort—and this is probably the original meaning—designates particularly that family which held the principality in each tribe and race as the family of the first-born (so that the representatives of tribes might be called also heads of the houses of the father) (4).

The *principles* of the Mosaic law of families are the following:—Each family forms a self-contained whole, which, as far as possible, is to be preserved in its integrity. Each Israelite is a citizen of the theocracy only by being a member of a certain clan of the covenant people; hence the value of genealogical trees. The representation of the family descends in the male line, and therefore marriages between the various tribes and families are of course allowed. On the contrary, if the male line has died out, the female line receives independent recognition for the preservation of the family, in order that no family in Israel may perish (a thing which is regarded as a special divine judgment). The separation of family possessions is based on the separation of the families themselves.

The following points are the most important for biblical theology:—1. The law of marriage; 2. The relation of parents and children; 3. The law of inheritance, and the provisions touching the continuance of a family and its possessions,

(the avenging of blood goes along with this); 4. The law concerning servants (5).

(1) With reference to the expression אלפים, *thousands*, see in particular 1 Sam. x. 19, comp. with ver. 21. It is probable that this designation arose from Moses having followed, as much as possible, the natural organization of the tribes when, according to Ex. xviii. 25, he divided the people by thousands, hundreds, etc. (§ 98), for the purpose of the administration of justice. See art. "Stämme Israels," in Herzog.

(2) The term is thus a sort of compound; comp. Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb.* 8th ed. § 270*c*. Thus, in 2 Kings xvii. 29, 32, בֵּית בָּמוֹת means houses of high places.—When רְאשֵׁי precedes, the shorter form אָבוֹת is sometimes used instead of בֵּית אָבוֹת (Num. xxxvi. 1; 1 Chron. vii. 11; comp. with ver. 9, viii. 10, 13, etc.) [in the article cited above].

(3) As also מִשְׁפָּחָה is frequently used in a wider, and שֵׁבֶט (Num. iv. 18; Judg. xx. 12) in a narrower sense [in the article cited above].

(4) It is difficult to decide the controversy, and we cannot here enter into it particularly. For the former view, comp. Knobel on Ex. vi. 14; this is the most common view. In reference to the latter view, which is, I believe, the right one, see, in particular, Keil's thorough discussion in his *Bibl. Archäol.* ii. pp. 197, 201 ff. [and Dillmann on Ex. vi., 14].—A certain number of heads was probably requisite to obtain the rank of a clan or father's house; for in 1 Chron. xxiii. 11 it is said, in reference to two descendants of a Levitical race, that they were united into one paternal house on account of the small number of their children; comp., too, Mic. v. 1. The number of one thousand men able to go to war (see note 1) may have been the minimum size of a clan. But the clans must have been much larger at the numbering of the people related in Num. xxvi., when the people (without counting the tribe of Levi, which was not mustered) were divided into fifty-seven clans.—The subdivisions of the people were mainly formed on the principle, that as the tribes sprang from Jacob's sons, so the clans sprang from his grandchildren, and the father's houses from his great-grandchildren. However, it lay in the nature of the case that this original relationship was modified in many ways in the course of time. Some clans disappeared, while from others new ones were formed, in ways for which no fixed principle can be found, and which were doubtless modified by very various circumstances. —Examples to illustrate the above propositions in the above-cited article, p. 770.

(5) If we were discussing a system of modern law, we should adopt a very different division; but the *Theology of the Old Testament* must explain the law as much as possible in the real connection in which it appears in the legislation itself.

1. THE LAW OF MARRIAGE.

§ 102.

(*a*) *The Contracting of Marriage: the Dependent Position of the Wife, and the Forms of the Marriage Contract.*

In the Mosaic law, *woman* appears not, indeed, in the position of degradation which she has among most other Oriental nations, but *still dependent*, inasmuch as her will is subject before marriage to the will of her father, and after marriage to the will of her husband; it is only when this tie is loosed that the wife holds a position of relative independence. This principle comes out with special clearness in the law concerning vows, Num. xxx. 4–10 (comp. § 134, with note 10).

The *marriage contract* is generally supposed to have rested on a bargain made between the parents of the bride and bridegroom, in virtue of which a price was paid to the *father* of the bride for his daughter, מֹהַר (generally translated "dowry") (and so the principle just stated would come out even in the making of the marriage). According to others, on the contrary (1), no such selling took place, and מֹהַר means the present sent to the *bride* by the bridegroom, to which were added other presents called מַתָּן or מַתָּנוֹת, for the kinsfolk of the bride. Certainly this is the manner of procedure in Gen. xxiv. 53, with which we may compare xxxiv. 12; and in xxiv. 58 the consent of the eldest brother and the bride herself is demanded, besides that of the parents (2). Further, if the example of Jacob's wooing and his treatment by Laban are adduced in favor of the dominant view, the opposite opinion appeals to Gen. xxxi. 15, where Laban's daughters complain that their father has treated them like *strangers*, and wasted their money (כִּסְּפָנוּ). But not only does 1 Sam. xviii. 25 speak for the view that the Mohar was given to the father, but also the passages Ex. xxii. 16, Deut. xxii. 29 (in which, in the case of a maiden being forced, the Mohar was given to the father), as well as the circumstance that, Ex. xxi. 7, the father had the right to sell his daughter to another, who wished her either for his own wife or for his son's wife (3). It is most probable that *various forms of the marriage contract existed side by side* (4), and that the nobler form is to be looked upon as having come down from patriarchal times. As a rule, the wife did not bring *property* into the marriage, for by the law property rests with the husband. Heiresses are exceptions, as we shall see later (§ 106). Still at least one example of a dowry is mentioned in Josh. xv. 18 f. The law does not require a *religious consecration* of the matrimonial tie; but it is clear from Mal. ii. 14 that marriage was to be regarded as a divinely sanctioned bond. *Purity* of entrance into the married state is guarded by such laws as Deut. xxiii. 13 ff. and ver. 28 f. Owing to the wife's dependent state, marriage with women not Israelites could not in general be specially objected to; compare the law on marriage with virgins taken in war, Deut. xxi. 10–13 (even Moses himself had a Cushite wife, Num. xii. 1); only marriage with Canaanitish women was absolutely forbidden, Ex. xxxiv. 16, Deut. vii. 3. The wife's dependent place favored the spread of *polygamy*, although, as has been already remarked (§ 69), this was in contradiction to the Mosaic idea of marriage. It is nowhere expressly approved, but is limited only by the provision in Lev. xviii. 18 (comp. § 69, 2). In the same way, it is forbidden by the law, Ex. xxi. 10 f., to allow the rights of the first married wife to suffer by a later marriage.

(1) So, for example, following Saalschütz, Keil, *Archäologie*, ii. p. 67 ff. [Comp. on this and the other questions referred to in this section, and especially on the position of woman in the Old Testament, Bestmann, *Gesch. d. chr. Sitte*, i. 264 ff.]

(2) Gen. xxiv. 58: "Wilt thou go with the man?—I will go."

(3) On Ex. xxi. 7, touching the rights of servants, see § 110.

(4) Even Roman law knows various forms of the marriage contract.

§ 103.

Continuation: Bars to Marriage (1).

In the Mosaic law of marriage, the provisions concerning *obstacles to marriage* which stand in marked contrast with the depravity of Canaanitish and Egyptian heathenism (Lev. xviii. 3, 24, xx. 23), and in which the moral earnestness of the Mosaic law is brought out, occupy an important place. These provisions are contained in Lev. xviii. 6–18, xx. 11–21; to which are added Deut. xxvii. 20, 22 f. All marriages with near relations are forbidden, and that not only with blood relations, but also with connections by affinity. In reference to *blood relationship*, the principle laid down is (Lev. xviii. 6), אִישׁ אִישׁ אֶל-כָּל-שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ לֹא תִקְרְבוּ. We see here that the word שְׁאֵר (flesh) stands directly for a blood relation, *e.g.* ver. 12, etc.; and שְׁאֵרָה is a designation of blood relationship, ver. 17. Marriage is forbidden between parents and children, grandparents and grandchildren; also between brothers and sisters—as well between half as full brother and sister; likewise marriage with the sister of the father and mother, but not marriage between uncle and niece, is forbidden (Lev. xviii. 6–13). Nevertheless, marriage with an aunt is not treated as a crime worthy of death, like the rest; it is only said, Lev. xx. 19, "they shall bear their iniquity." But the punishment of death was appointed for the other forbidden marriages, xx. 17; comp. Deut. xxvii. 22. The history of Tamar, in 2 Sam. xiii. 13, raises a difficulty, because there marriage with a half-sister seems to be looked on as permitted. Probably the words are only to be understood as an attempt at escape on the part of Tamar.—Among connections by affinity (Lev. xviii. 8, 14 ff.) marriage is forbidden—1. with a step-mother, step-daughter, step-grandchild, mother-in-law, and daughter-in-law. These are punished by death, Lev. xx. 11–14; comp. Deut. xxvii. 20, 23; 2. marriage with an uncle's widow on the father's side, and with a brother's widow—the latter with the exception of the Levirate marriage (on this later, § 106)—that is, if the brother has left children by his wife. Over these last-named marriages impends the punishment of childlessness, which is not to be understood, with J. D. Michaelis (*Mos. Recht*, v. p. 199), as referring to civil childlessness—that is, that the children of such a marriage were not reckoned to their real father, but to his dead brother or his father's brother, but is rather to be regarded as the actual withdrawal of the blessing of children threatened by God, so that no judicial act takes place.—Marriage with the widow of a mother's brother, and a wife's sister after the wife's death, was allowed; for the prohibition mentioned in § 102, Lev. xviii. 18 (that a man may not marry two sisters), refers expressly only to the time when the wife still lives; marrying both at the same time, as the patriarch Jacob did, was forbidden (2).

On what ground do these provisions of the law rest? Some of them may appear singular in view of the fact that the Pentateuch gives instances of such marriages from very early history, and even relates that Abraham married a half-sister, for this is the most probable view of his relation to Sarah. Michaelis (*l.c.* p. 178 ff.) takes the view that such prohibitions had only the purpose of preventing the seduction of persons living together in one house; but

this is certainly wrong, for in this case such marriages would not be *shameful in themselves*, as they are called, viz., זִמָּה (Lev. xviii. 17, xx. 14, etc.), an expression which properly means a design, malice, but is used in the Old Testament of gross crime ; and further, חֶסֶד, disgrace, xx. 17 (in the Aramaic use of the word), תֶּבֶל, ver. 12. Even reference to the *horror naturalis* is not sufficient ; for, as several heathen nations allowed marriages with the nearest blood relatives (in Lev. xviii. 3, 24 this is mentioned as customary among the Egyptians and Canaanites), it is manifest that it is in the first instance a *moral* horror that must prevent such marriages, and that the feeling that is called *horror naturalis* proceeds only from this. The moral ground for the prohibition can be no other than the fact that *a moral fellowship is already constituted through the natural forms of near relationship, which would be disturbed by the matrimonial bond.* Parental and fraternal love on the one side, and the love of married persons on the other, are so specifically different, that by mixing the two neither can find full and holy development. The one moral relationship is sacrificed, without the other being really called into existence (3). As far as a definitely marked moral relation is constituted by relationship, so far is it forbidden to mingle it with the marriage relation. Even the marriage of a nephew with the sister of the father or mother breaks up a natural relationship, since the man ought to be the head of the woman ; but not so the marriage of an uncle and niece. The circumstance that marriage is forbidden with a father's brother's widow, and not with a mother's brother's widow, is, I believe, to be explained by the fact that the father's brother stands in a position of higher authority toward the nephew than does the mother's brother, in virtue of the value which the husband's side has in the family.—With the reason just stated is connected the further reason given by Augustine, that by divine ordinance the moral fellowship of mankind was to be realized in a variety of forms. In ancient times this purpose was served by the marriage of brother and sister ; indeed, that was the only means of realizing it. But Abraham's marriage with his half-sister, if Sarah really was such, seems, from the Mosaic standpoint, to have been justified mainly because through it alone the pollution of the race of revelation by heathen elements was prevented ; comp. Gen. xxiv. 3 (4).

(1) The provisions on this point are very fully given in the Old Testament. Biblical theology must, of course, here confine itself rigidly to what is expressly stated. When Thiersch (*Der Verbot der Ehe in zu naher Verwandtschaft*, 1869) proceeds on the supposition that the law gives concrete provisions, from which other provisions are to be deduced, this is quite right in itself (and, indeed, is true of the whole Mosaic law). But if, from the provisions in the Mosaic law of bars to marriage, we infer the existence of others, the question is whether we hit the right principle ; and here, I believe, Thiersch has failed.

(2) This is the famous point of controversy so often discussed in the English Parliament. But there can be no doubt upon the matter whatever. All the arguments brought to prove that marriage with the sister of a dead wife is, according to Mosaism, a sin, and the analogies on which this conclusion is based (*e.g.* by O. v. Gerlach) are quite worthless.—Difficult is לְצָרֹר in Lev. xviii. 18. Many, as Gesenius, give the word a sense not elsewhere found in Hebrew (but in Arabic) : "ita *ut zelotypæ fiant* una alterius æmula sit," "to jealousy ;" but it is probably to be taken in a wider sense, "to hostility ;" [so also Dillmann. On the other hand, P. de Lagarde (*Nachrichten d. K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göt-*

tingen, 1882, xiii. 393 ff.) endeavor to prove that צרר in Lev. xviii. 18 is to be regarded as a denominative verb from the substantive צָרָה common to the Hebrews, Syrians, and Arabs, which is the technical for a wife added to one or several wives; the verb would then signify "for a co-wife," or "to make a co-wife"].

(3) Comp. Nitzsch, *System of Christian Doctrine*, § 174: "Matrimonial love must not destroy or perplex that to which it is itself traceable, and which it wishes to reproduce and propagate."

(4) The further discussion of this topic does not belong to biblical theology, but partly to ethics and partly to ecclesiastical law. On the whole subject, compare especially the excellent essay in the *Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, 1840, the June and July numbers, p. 369 ff.: "Ueber die verbotenen Ehen in der Verwandtschaft."—Among the marriage laws of the ancient nations, that of Rome corresponds best with that of the Old Testament, and is even in some respects more rigorous. See Rossbach, *Untersuchungen ueber die römische Ehe*, p. 420 ff. The principle on which marriages are forbidden is very clearly expressed in Roman law; it lies in the *patria potestas*. The son remained under the father's power until the father's death; grandsons and granddaughters honored their grandfather as their father. Thus the children of brethren took the position of brothers and sisters, and hence, apparently, the marriage of cousins (*consobrini*) was not allowed in older times. Roman law also absolutely prohibited marriage with the offspring of a brother or sister; even marriage between uncle and niece was forbidden. However, in the year 49 A.D., such marriage, which was counted incest until then, was allowed by a senatus-consultum because Claudius wished to marry Agrippina, the daughter of his brother Germanicus.

§ 104.

(*b*) *The Dissolution of Marriage.*

The laws touching the *dissolution of marriage* also show how greatly the personal rights of the wife are limited in the Mosaic legislation. The dissolution of marriage can take place *in two ways*:—1. By the disruption in fact of the matrimonial bond by the sin of *adultery;* 2. By a *divorce* drawn up in a definite form.

1. In the Mosaic law, *adultery* is so understood that it is only committed through the unchastity of a *wife*. Thus, on the part of the husband, adultery is committed only when he dishonors the *free* wife of another; in this case both are to be punished with death (Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22). If, on the contrary, the adulteress was only another's slave, the punishment was milder, Lev. xix. 20–22 (probably corporal punishment). Otherwise, the crime of adultery could not occur on the part of a husband, for the wife had no exclusive right to him. Therefore by simple unchastity he offends indeed against the law which condemns as an abomination all fornication, and especially such prostitution as was committed among the neighboring heathen nations in honor of their divinity Lev. xix. 29; Deut. xxiii. 18), but not against his wife. On the contrary, the breach by the wife of the obligations of marriage was unconditionally adultery. If a woman was suspected of adultery without being taken in the act, and if no testimony could be brought to prove the offence, it was to be decided whether she was guilty or not guilty by a *formal oath* at the sanctuary, and the drinking of the *water of the curse*, since under the circumstances a judicial action could not be brought; comp. Num. v. 11–31. The effect to be produced by the water of the curse on the guilty wife—the swelling of the abdomen and decaying of the

thigh (which Josephus makes the dislocation of the right thigh) corresponds to the *jus talionis*. Ver. 27 does not say that the sentence of God shall be manifested on the spot (as was the assumption in the German ordeals). But we must suppose an effect which could only be traced to the drinking of the water of the curse, and which followed speedily thereupon, as otherwise there would have been no sure mark by which to clear guiltless wives. The law rests on the assurance that the living God, who dwells in the midst of His people, will really acknowledge the solemn invocation of His name at His own command (1).

2. *Divorce* (כְּרִיתוּת). *The right of divorce belongs to the husband only;* divorce is therefore called the dismissal of a wife (שִׁלַּח אִשָּׁה) (2). The right of the husband to dismiss his wife is nevertheless not formally sanctioned by the law, but is presupposed as existing, and is limited, not only by the law in Deut. xxii. 19, 29, but also (on this see below) even in the law of divorce in Deut. xxiv., by the addition עֶרְוַת דָּבָר. The proper aim of the law (Deut. xxiv. 1 ff.) lies in the closing sentence, ver. 4. Ver. 1 does not contain a command, and even its last clause belongs to the conditional clause (3). The Pharisees indeed say (Matt. xix. 7): Τί οὖν Μωϋσῆς ἐνετείλατο δοῦναι βιβλίον ἀποστασίου καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν; but the Lord answers, ver. 8: Ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν ἀπολῦσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν. Deut. xxiv. 1 shows that this process was to be necessary in cases of divorce. Since a formal *bill of divorcement* (סֵפֶר כְּרִיתֻת, ver. 1) was requisite for the carrying out of a divorce, this might at least often prevent a too hasty repudiation. The passage assigns as the ground which renders divorce admissible עֶרְוַת דָּבָר—that is, "shamefulness of a thing." There existed among the Rabbins two different views concerning the meaning of this expression. The school of *Hillel* understood the expression to mean any matter of offence (4). The school of *Shammai*, on the contrary, did not, indeed, as has frequently been erroneously said, interpret the expression simply of adultery. Real adultery is not to be thought of, because in that case not divorce but punishment followed; but they referred it to really shameful conduct, such as unchaste behavior and the like. It is not to be admitted that Hillel (as many archæologists say) has hit the meaning of the law more correctly. The expression must certainly refer to something loathsome, comp. Deut. xxiii. 15 (5). If the divorced woman married another man, she might not, on his death, or on being divorced from him, remarry the first one, Deut. xxiv. 3 f. compared with Jer. iii. 1. In David's conduct, recounted in 2 Sam. iii. 14 ff. (that David took again Michal, whom Saul had given to another), there is no offence against the letter of the law; for David had not separated himself from Michal, but she was unfairly torn away from him, 1 Sam. xxv. 44. Nevertheless Saalschütz (*l.c.* p. 802) rightly remarks that David's conduct can hardly be regarded as consonant with the spirit of the law. The law does not say whether the divorce might be taken back if the divorced wife did not marry again. Probably that was lawful.

It is clear that this whole matter of divorce does not correspond to the idea of marriage proper to the Old Testament and already expounded by us (§ 69, 2); and this is expressly set forth by Christ in Matt. xix. 8. Moreover, in Mal. ii. 10–16, divorce is treated as a breach of faith: "I hate putting away, saith Jehovah the God of Israel" (ver. 16).

(1) The *punishment* of the adulteress lay in the effect of the water of the curse; the purpose of the divine decision is not that the convicted person may be then handed over to human judgment for the execution of the punishment appointed for adultery in Lev. xx. 10, Deut. xxii. 22.—This law is one of the series of regulations by which the purity of family life was to be protected. Yet its special aim is, not merely to frighten frivolous women from leading a dissolute life, but to protect the wife against the wrath of the jealous husband, by withdrawing from him the right of taking the vindication of his interests into his own hand, and by compelling him to submit his suspicion to the judgment of the omniscient God.

(2) According to the Rabbinical view (see Saalschütz, *Mos. Recht*, p. 806), it was a matter of course that the wife to whom her husband denied what is commanded in Ex. xxi. 10 might demand a divorce.

(3) Deut. xxiv. 1 ff.: "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her,"—then the verse does not go on, as Luther and A.V. give it, "then let him write her a bill of divorcement," but, continuing the conditional clause, "and he write her a bill of divorcement, and give it into her hand and send her out of his house, and she go," etc.; the apodosis begins only in ver. 4.

(4) For example, if the wife have let the dinner burn; if even, says Rabbi Akiba, another please the husband better. Josephus holds the same lax view, *Ant.* iv. 8. 23: *καθ' ἁσθητοσοῦν αἰτίας.*

(5) The LXX have indeed softened the expression by the translation *ἀσχημον πρᾶγμα*, but have probably caught the general meaning correctly.

2. THE RELATION OF PARENTS TO CHILDREN (1).

§ 105.

The importance of this relation appears from its being made, like the relation of marriage, analogous to the relation of Jehovah toward His people (comp. § 82, 1). In explaining the decalogue, we have already spoken of the way in which the command to honor parents is ranked among the duties of piety in the first table (§ 86, with note 2) (2). The same promise is given to the honoring of parents as to obedience to the divine will in general; comp. Ex. xx. 12 with Deut. iv. 40, vi. 2, etc. Breach of the reverence due to parents is punished in just the same way as offences against the reverence due to God, Ex. xxi. 15, 17 (3), Lev. xx. 9.—Still the parents have only such rights over their children as are consistent with the acknowledgment of *God's higher right of property* [which is sealed by circumcision]. This thought is conveyed in the command to offer up Isaac, Gen. xxii. (comp. § 23, with note 9), but particularly in the ordinance with reference to the *redemption of the first-born sons*, who here vicariously take the place of the whole blessing of children hoped for. Although the tribe of Levi (comp. § 93) was accepted in the stead of all the first-born of the people, the first-born sons must nevertheless be brought to the sanctuary when a month old, and there be redeemed by the payment of five shekels; see Num. xviii. 16 in connection with Ex. xiii. 15. This presentation at the sanctuary might be conjoined with the offering of purification, to be presented by the woman on the fortieth day after her delivery, as appears from Luke ii. 22 ff. Even the *human right of parents* over their children is limited—a remarkable difference from the laws of other nations—in particular, the father has no right over the life and death of his children (such as Roman law concedes) (4), but the parents must

bring a disobedient, reckless son before the magistrates, Deut. xxi. 18 (comp. § 99, with note 2).—The law also requires that a holy *education* in the fear and love of God be given to children. There are no special precepts in the law with a view to this, but it is repeated again and again with great emphasis, that the divine deeds in the redemption and guidance of Israel, and the divine commands, are to be impressed on the children ; see Deut. iv. 9 f., vi. 6 f. (5) ; also ver. 20 ff., xi. 19, xxxii. 46, comp. with Gen. xviii. 19 (Ps. lxxviii. 3–6, xliv. 2), etc. The passover, in particular, was to serve to hand down from age to age the knowledge of Israel's redemption from Egyptian bondage ; for in Ex. xii. 26 f., xiii. 8, the people are expressly directed to join with the festival the historical instruction of the children in the object of the feast. The same direction is given, xiii. 14 f., for the presentation of the first-born. We may say that by those Deuteronomic regulations the basis was laid for the memorizing which characterized the later Jewish instruction. But the Pentateuch knows nothing of a scholastic inculcation of the divine laws ; it knows no formal religious instruction at all. With the exception of the command, Deut. xxxi. 11–13, that the law be read before the assembled people, including the children (טַף = little children), at the feast of tabernacles, there is no direct provision for instruction in the law (6). The passage in Deuteronomy just cited presupposes that the children take part in the festival pilgrimages, as also the presence of the sons and daughters at the celebration of the festivals in the sanctuary is spoken of in the law of feasts in Deut. xvi. 11, 14 ; and in particular, by the transference of the celebration of the passover to the place of the sanctuary, the pilgrimage of the whole family thither was favored. Nevertheless, the law in Ex. xxiii. 17, Deut. xvi. 16, which enjoins the pilgrimage of all the male members of the family, contains no regulation in respect to *age*. The Rabbinical tradition that boys in their twelfth year were bound to fulfil the law may be very ancient, but the earliest indication of this rule which we have is in the history of Jesus when He was twelve years old, and in Josephus' statement (*Ant.* v. 10. 4) that Samuel was called to be a prophet in the twelfth year of his life (7).

(1) Comp. my article, "Pädagogik des A. T.," in Schmid's *Pädagog. Encyklop.* v. p. 653 ff.

(2) The theocratic principle, that all authority among the covenant people is to be regarded as an efflux of divine authority, and as sanctified by this, finds its application here.

(3) Ex. xxi. 15, 17 : "He who smiteth father or mother, and he who curses father and mother, shall surely be put to death."

(4) See what is remarked on the abrogation of the judicial power of the father of a family in § 98, and comp. Prov. xix. 18.

(5) Deut. iv. 9 : "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen : but teach them thy sons, and thy sons' sons."—vi. 6 f. : "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart : and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

(6) Though it is natural to conjecture that the scattering of the *Levites* among the other tribes was to serve to promote the knowledge of the law, the Pentateuch gives no injunction concerning this.

(7) *Singing* was another vehicle for the propagation of religious knowledge, which we can show to have been cultivated in Israel from the earliest period of

the nation's history. See the particulars in the above-cited article, p. 671.—It was certainly a very ancient custom to teach the youth songs, in order to fix the memory of great events and of the heroes of past days (2 Sam. i. 18, comp. Ps. lx. 1). Also, with reference to the song in Deut. xxxii., it is commanded, xxxi. 19 ff., that it should be taught, in order to serve in later times as a witness against the people.—Lastly, the many *local monuments* scattered through the land served the rising generation as instructive witnesses. Thus we read in Josh iv. 6 f., 21 f., with reference to the stones set up on the banks of the Jordan : " When your children ask their fathers in time to come, saying, what mean you by these stones ? then ye shall answer them," etc. Thus, in particular, the memories of patriarchal times were linked with memorable trees, wells, altars, stone-heaps, etc., Gen. xxi. 32 f., xxvi. 19 ff., xxxiii. 20, xxxi. 46 ff., xxxv. 7, 20, l. 11.

3. THE LAW OF INHERITANCE, AND PROVISIONS FOR THE PERMANENCE OF FAMILIES AND THEIR INHERITANCE.

§ 106.

The Law of Inheritance. Laws concerning Heiresses and the Levirate Marriage.

After the father's death the *first-born son* is the head of the family, and therefore in family registers he is often distinguished by this honorable title ; cf. Num. iii. 12, etc. By the law in Deut. xxi. 17, the provision that the first-born son is to receive a double inheritance is confirmed, and therefore, doubtless, the care of the mother and unmarried sisters, etc., was incumbent on him. This regulation probably rested on ancient usage ; for Jacob followed it (comp. § 25) when he gave the inheritance of a double tribe to Joseph, who, in the place of Reuben, was invested with the right of the first-born, comp. 1 Chron. v. 2. But it is remarkable that here again (comp. § 69, 2) the law, Deut. xxi. 15–17, forbids others to imitate what the patriarch did when he gave preference to the son of the beloved spouse. For the rest, the rule of inheritance was apparently that the other sons inherited equally. If an Israelite left behind him no son, but only daughters, the daughters came into the inheritance ; if he had also no daughter, the brother inherited ; in want of a brother, the brother of the father ; and if he had none, the nearest blood relation, Num. xxvii. 8-11. But to prevent land from passing into the possession of another tribe, daughters who were heiresses might, according to the law, Num. xxxvi., marry only men of the tribe of their father, or even, if vers. 6 and 8 are to be understood in a narrow sense, only men of their father's house ; probably in as close a relationship as was admissible, as the heiresses (the daughters of Zelophehad) mentioned in Num. xxxvi. took, ver. 11, the sons of their father's brothers for husbands.—Side by side with this ordinance stands the *Levirate law*, which, as we see from Gen. xxxviii., rested on ancient custom, but was legally sanctioned by Deut. xxv. 5–10. Its main provisions run thus (ver. 5 f.) : "If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without (that is, out of the family) unto a stranger : her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her (יְבָם). And it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel." The exposition of the law is doubtful. On one view, the presupposition of "dwelling together"

is taken to mean that the brother who accepts the Levirate duty has as yet no house of his own, and is thus still unmarried (for this the phrase, "if brethren dwell together" is urged). According to another view, on the contrary, it is only presupposed that the brother lived in the same place, and was therefore in the position to take up the Levirate duty. The words, "if he have no son," are understood by the Jewish and many Christian expositors (among the moderns, also Keil and Fr. W. Schultz) of childlessness in general, so that if there was a daughter to be heiress, no Levirate marriage would be entered on; and for this the expressions Matt. xxii. 25 (*μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα*) and Luke xx. 28 (*ἄτεκνος*) seem to speak. Another view is that the law of Levirate marriage took precedence of the law of heiresses, so that a daughter did not inherit if there was still a marriageable widow. Vers. 7–10 of the law decree a public censure on the man who would not comply with the Levirate law (but there was no compulsion). Nothing appears to be decreed against the woman who would not comply with the duty enjoined by the Levirate law, if she did not wish to marry again at all. Childlessness was such a disgrace to a woman, that it might be presumed that she would not refuse without sufficient reason. If the dead man left no brother who could enter on the duty of marriage, the obligation passed to the nearest relative, who received by the marriage also the right of inheritance. It is true that the law makes no provision about this, but it is clear from the book of Ruth that such was the legal custom. That the Levirate law was still in force in the time of Jesus is shown by Matt. xxii. 24 ff. (and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke).

§ 107.

Provisions concerning the Preservation of the Family Inheritance.

As the law was concerned for the continued existence of families, so, too, provision was made for the *preservation of the property* on which the subsistence of the family depended. As far as possible, the inheritance was to be preserved entire. Here the *theocratic principle* in its full force came in, and its application to questions of proprietorship is expressed in the declaration, Lev. xxv. 23, "The land is mine; for ye are strangers and foreigners with me"—that is, God, the King of the people, is the real proprietor of the land, and He gives it to the people only as tenants. Now, inasmuch as each family forms an integral part of the theocracy, an inheritance is given to it by Jehovah for its subsistence, which forms, as it were, an hereditary feudal holding, and is therefore in itself inalienable. Hence Naboth's refusal, 1 Kings xxi. 3; and hence the strong language of the prophets against the efforts of the rich to enlarge their possessions by adding to their own lands the inheritance of others, Isa. v. 8 ff., and in other passages.—When an Israelite is compelled by poverty to alienate his inheritance, this is only for a time; the purchaser of the inheritance must, by Lev. xxv. 23–27, return it as soon as the former possessor, or his nearest relative, redeems it again (נָאַל); hence the general legal principle, ver. 23 f., "The land shall not be sold לִצְמִתֻת to extinction,"—that is, in such a way that the possession is forever forfeited by the original owner,—"but in all the land of your possessions ye shall grant a redemption (גְּאֻלָּה) for the land." In virtue of this duty to redeem

the land, the nearest relative bears the name of גֹּאֲלוֹ הַקָּרֹב. At the redeeming of the land, the value which the purchaser has had from the use of it year by year is to be taken from the purchase money—that is, the land itself is never to be actually sold, but only what it bore, and that for a certain time. In the year of jubilee, however, every possession is to return to the family to which it originally belonged, without redemption. With a consistent administration of this law, a class wholly without property would have been impossible in Israel (1), agreeably to what is proposed as the problem of the theocratic life, Deut. xv. 4, viz., that there be no poor person in Israel; though, indeed, it is acknowledged in ver. 11 that actual circumstances will continue to be inconsistent with the realization of this ideal. Since, as has already been mentioned (§ 33), at the settlement in the Holy Land, the several clans dwelt together in a definite place, the family became the basis of all social life; but because the clans had always to recognize that they were integral portions of the covenant people, the lively consciousness of national aims was preserved (2); and this all-pervading influence of family life upon the higher theocratico-national principle is represented particularly in the celebration of the Passover.

(1) This is why the Socialist Proudhon admires so greatly the Mosaic law of property. Compare his essay, "The Observance of Sunday considered with reference to Public Health, Morals, Family and Civil Life," in the German translation, 1850, p. 25.

(2) Baumgarten (*Die Geschichte Jesu*, p. 88 f.) has rightly observed, that in the theocracy two forms of one-sidedness are avoided,—the one-sidedness of a tribal constitution, in which the tribes never attain national unity; and the one-sidedness of a national constitution in which domestic life, and with it an essential part of society, are sacrificed to the welfare of the state, as was the case in the laws of Lycurgus. "In Israel, the divine guidance is manifest in the fact that both forms, the house and the kingdom, are so planned from the beginning that they mutually penetrate and embrace each other."

§ 108.

The Avenging of Blood (1).

Blood revenge is connected with the laws last discussed, inasmuch as it may be regarded from one point of view as serving for the preservation of the entireness of families.—Blood revenge, generally speaking, takes place where the members of a family or the next relative of a murdered man have the right and the duty of exercising retribution on the manslayer. In the Old Testament, it is taken for granted as a very ancient custom (2). After Gen. ix. 6, in which is expressed generally the precept that he who sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, the first indication of the avenging of blood is found in xxvii. 45 (3). Where as yet there is no political life, or where, at least, such life is still in the first elements of development, the expiation of injury to personal rights devolves, from the nature of the case, on the zeal of the family (4). The Mosaic legislation retained this feature, but subordinated the execution of the avenging of blood to the theocratic principle. If, according to the most ancient Hellenic view, the murderer, as such, commits no crime against the divinity or against civil society (5), but merely against the family, Mosaism, on the contrary, in virtue of its idea

of man as the divine image (comp. § 68), discerns in murder, first of all, *a transgression against the Creator and Lord of human life*, Gen. ix. 5 f., which must be atoned for, Num. xxxv. 33, by the extermination of the guilty person from the theocracy, which is desecrated by the guilt of blood (6). God Himself is the proper avenger of blood (Gen. *l.c.*), the דֹּרֵשׁ דָּמִים (Ps. ix. 13, comp. 2 Chron. xxiv. 22), to whom the shed blood cries for vengeance, Gen. iv. 10. Thus the avenging of blood becomes a divine command; it is not merely a matter of honor, but a duty of religion. But because the *family*, the protection of the integrity of which is the business of theocratic justice, is injured at the same time by the murder, the execution of the avenging of blood is transferred to that relative on whom in general the restoration of injuries done to the integrity of the family is incumbent (comp. § 106 f.), and who thus has to *redeem* the blood taken from the family by the crime committed. Hence the name of the avenger of blood, גֹּאֵל הַדָּם, Num. xxxv. 19, Deut. xix. 6, 12; also גֹּאֵל absolutely, Num. xxxv. 12, Job xix. 25 (7). To see that the avenging of blood was really executed was the business of the whole clan, as is clear from 2 Sam. xiv. 7 (8).—But further, with reference to the avenging of blood, the following provisions are found in Ex. xxi. 12–14, Num. xxxv. 9–34, Deut. xix. 1–13:

1. In Num. xxxv. *two kinds of murder* are distinguished in reference to which the avenging of blood is commanded: (*a*) vers. 16–18, if one slays another with an instrument of iron, or a stone, or with wood, wherewith a man when he takes it in his hand (others, because it fills the hand) can kill another—that is, if any one strikes another in such a way that death may be foreseen to be the probable consequence; (*b*) ver. 20 f., if one has slain another out of hatred, or by design, or out of enmity, in which case the means by which death was brought about is indifferent (9). On the other hand, in order to shelter from vengeance him who had slain a man undesignedly, בְּלֹא צְדִיָּה (ver. 22; Ex. xxi. 13), without intending to hurt his neighbor (comp. Num. xxxv. 23), and inadvertently, בִּבְלִי־דַעַת (Deut. xix. 4, etc.), the law provided for the selection of *six free cities*, three on the east, and three on the west side of the Jordan (Deut. iv. 41 ff.; Josh. xx. 1–9). The manslayer who fled into one of these must be protected from the avenger of blood who pursued him, after a provisional cognizance of the case by the elders of the free town (Josh. xx. 4), until the community (עֵדָה)—that is, the community of the place where the murder was committed, Num. xxxv. 24 f.—had, through their elders, examined the matter, Deut. xix. 12 f. (8). If the accused person was proved guilty of intentional murder, he *must* be given over to the avenger of blood, and even the altar could not protect him (Ex. xxi. 14). In the opposite case, however, he was obliged to remain in the city of refuge until the death of the high priest in whose time the murder had occurred, Num. xxxv. 28, Josh. xx. 6. If he quitted it earlier, the avenger of blood was permitted to kill him, Num. xxxv. 27, as was allowed before, in his flight to the city of refuge, Deut. xix. 6.—The meaning of the banishment to the city of refuge was certainly not merely that of an ordinary punishment of banishment; but the manslayer was to be withdrawn from general intercourse with the people until the expiation of his act was completed. Expiation was absolutely necessary, on the analogy of the sin-offering, Lev. iv. 1 ff., even for blood shed undesignedly (9). This expiation seems to lie in the death of the high priest, which does the same for his

period of office as his function on the great day of atonement does for a single year (10).

2. For *intentional* murder, there was no other expiation than the blood of the manslayer, Num. xxxv. 31, 33 (11). The *jus talionis* is here maintained in the most stringent sense; every substitute for the punishment of death is refused (12). Nor can exemption from residence in the city of refuge in consequence of accidental murder be purchased, ver. 32.—This is essentially different from the usual custom of other ancient nations, which permitted the manslayer to satisfy the injured family by making compensation (ποινή among the Greeks), or *Wergeld* (among the Germans) (13).—Nevertheless, the Mosaic law does not ordain anything against the relatives who neglected the avenging of blood.

3. The avenging of blood falls upon the *doer* alone. Nowhere does the legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch allow the avenger of blood to lay hands also on the family of the murderer (Ex. xx. 5 is not a case in point). That an opposite custom may often have prevailed is probable; and on the contrary, Deut. xxiv. 16 (comp. 2 Kings xiv. 6) may be regarded as a *supplement*, not (as some think) a mitigation, of the earlier legal provisions.—We cannot certainly determine how long blood-revenge existed among the people. It is clear, from 2 Sam. xiv. 6–11, that it was still in existence and in full force in David's time.

(1) Compare my article "Blutrache," in Herzog's *R.E.* [revised in 2d ed. by Delitzsch; Riehm, art. "Bluträcher" in his *Handwörterbuch*].

(2) Not yet Gen. iv. 14: "I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond, and every one that findeth me shall kill me." These words of Cain are only to be understood as an expression of anguish of conscience.

(3) The words of Rebekah (Gen. xxvii. 45), "Why should I be deprived also of you both in one day?" mean, that if Jacob were slain by the hand of Esau, Esau would be slain by the avenger of blood.

(4) Thus among the Arabians, the ancient Greeks, Romans, Germans, etc.—Compare, in general, Tobien, *The avenging of blood according to the ancient Russian law, in comparison with the avenging of blood among the Israelites, Arabians, Greeks, Romans, and Germans*, Dorpat, 1840. On the avenging of blood among the Arabs, see J. D. Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, ii. § 134. (With the Arabian notion that unavenged blood remains without sinking into the ground, etc., see Schultens on *exc. Ham.* pp. 416, 466; compare in the Old Testament, Isa. xxvi. 21, Ezek. xxiv. 7 f., Job xvi. 18.) On the avenging of blood among the Greeks of Homer's time, see Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* p. 292 ff. On traces of the same in ancient Italy, see Rein, *Kriminalrecht der Römer*, p. 36 ff.; and on the difference between the Roman and German view, see Osenbrügge, in the *Kieler Philolog. Studien*, 1841, p. 234 ff.

(5) Homer knows nothing of an atonement for murder due to the gods; see Nägelsbach, *l.c.*; comp. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, i. p. 301; and also at the same time, in limitation, the remarks of Schömann, *Æschylos Eumeniden*, p. 66 f.

(6) Human life is so sacred, that even the *animal* by which a man is killed must be stoned, Ex. xxi. 28 ff.; comp. Gen. ix. 5.

(7) Compare Böttcher, *De inferis*, § 322.

(8) These sentences state as concisely as possible how the three different passages are probably to be combined.—Comp. Hengstenberg, *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, vol. ii.; Ranke gives another combination, *Unters. über den Pentateuch*, ii. p. 314 f.

(9) On the later Hellenic view, see Schömann, *l.c.* p. 69, and others. See Osenbrügge, *l.c.*, on the Roman expiatory sacrifice of a ram for unintentional murder.

(10) This is the one view of the matter taken, for example, by Keil. [More correctly, perhaps, Riehm : "With the high priest's entrance upon his office begins, as at the coronation of a new king, a new period, in which the legal consequences of much that occurred in the preceding reign are no longer recognized."]

(11) Num. xxxv. 33 : "Blood defileth the land ; and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it."

(12) A murder could not be made amends for with all the treasures in the world, even if the murdered man had forgiven the murderer before his death. Maimonides, *Hilch. rots.* i. 4, *More Neboch.* iii. 41.

(13) Compare Lobeck, *l.c.* p. 301. The Koran itself (*Sur.* ii. 173 ff.) admits a stipulated mitigation of blood-revenge.

4. THE RIGHTS OF SERVANTS IN THE HOUSE (1).

§ 109.

Bondage in the Time of the Patriarchs. The Principles of the Rights of Bondmen.

The Old Testament, in ascribing to man the nature and dignity of one made in the image of God as his inalienable and fundamental characteristic,—in teaching, further, the descent of all mankind from one blood, and so representing them as a race of brethren,—pronounces in advance a condition without personal rights, such as is seen in slavery among the heathen, to be inadmissible. It is designated as a *curse* when a race falls into slavery, Gen. ix. 25, 27. Nevertheless, the existence of a state of servitude in virtue of which domestics (עֲבָדָה) form a portion of property, like the herds (Gen. xxiv. 35, xxvi. 14), is presupposed in the Old Testament. Abraham possesses a number of slaves. The slaves *born in the house* (יְלִידֵי בַיִת, a term which refers at the same time to transmission of servitude), Gen. xiv. 14 (2), are distinguished from those *bought with money* (מִקְנַת כֶּסֶף), xvii. 23 ff. (3). Nevertheless, how elevated the position of the slave is in the time of the patriarchs, is shown specially in the beautiful picture of Abraham's trusted servant, drawn in chap. xxiv. This servant is probably the same person as the Eliezer whom Abraham (xv. 2 f.) for want of a son had appointed as his heir (2). But it was of the greatest importance that, according to chap. xvii., at the introduction of circumcision, all the slaves—not simply those who stood nearer to the family as being born in the house, but also those who had been bought in foreign parts—should receive likewise this sign of covenant consecration, and thereby a share in the dignity of the chosen race, and in the divine promise given to it (3).

The rights of the class of servants are more exactly defined by the *law ;* and in this connection a distinction is made between those servants who were Israelites by birth, and the slaves obtained by purchase or as booty from other nations. These regulations rest on a *twofold principle :* 1. Because Israel is the people of Jehovah's property, whom He redeemed from Egyptian bondage, the whole body of this people are *Jehovah's* servants, and are thereby exempted from all *human* servitude. After their God had broken the yoke which burdened them, and led them out "upright" [erect], they were never more to bend under the yoke of slavery, nor be sold as slaves (Lev. xxv. 42, 55, xxvi. 13 ; comp. § 83) (4). By this principle, bondage, in a strict sense, was for Israel completely done away with. But since the law leaves cases open in which one Israelite might fall into the ser-

vice of another in a legal way, instructions are laid down by which a return to the independent position which alone corresponds to the dignity of a theocratic burgher is secured to those who have fallen into servitude. On the contrary, with reference to the whole profane mass of the Gentiles, slavery is recognized as allowable, Lev. xxv. 44 ff. But apart from the fact that a certain share in the blessings of the covenant people is also secured to the heathen slaves, they have the advantage, 2. of the principle which is inculcated in a multitude of passages as the standard for the treatment of servants—namely, that the Israelites, since they themselves were at one time slaves and strangers in Egypt, and know how such persons feel, are to treat servants and strangers in a humane way, and show by this means their thanks to God, who redeemed them from Egyptian oppression (Ex. xxii. 20, xxiii. 9 ; Deut. v. 14 f., x. 19, xv. 15, xvi. 11 f., xxiv. 18, 22 (5).

(1) *Die Verhältnisse der Sklaven bei den alten Hebräern nach bibl.- und thalmudischen Quellen dargestellt*, Kopenhagen, 1859, a work by Mielziner, is a good monograph on this subject. A survey of the relevant literature is also given in it, p. 4 f.; comp. also my article, "Sklaverei bei den Hebräern," in Herzog's *R. E.* xiv. p. 464 ff.—On this topic it is of special interest to compare the rights, or absence of rights, of slaves in other nations.

(2) The patriarchal form of life brings the slaves nearer to the family, and thus the servile class become possessed of the moral spirit of the family, in virtue of which the relation between masters and servants is shaped into a relation of real respect and affection.—Compare what Nägelsbach has remarked, *Homer. Theol.* p. 271 ff., on the character of slavery in Homer.

(3) The full consequences of the anthropological presuppositions of the Old Testament were certainly not realized, even at a later time. But while in heathenism, and especially in cultivated heathenism, slavery sinks more and more to the deepest degradation of human nature, Mosaism guards its humane character by at least limiting slavery, so far as it permits it, by legal regulations.

(4) [Lev. xxv. 42 : "For they are my servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt : they shall not be sold as bondmen." The slavery of an Israelite was contradictory to Jehovah's exclusive right of property in his people.]

(5) The various regulations with reference to the rights of servants form one of the most difficult parts of the legislation. It is on them in particular that the assertion is founded, that the legislation in Deuteronomy stands in absolute contradiction to that in Leviticus. See the solutions proposed in the next section.

§ 110.

(*a*) *The Regulations concerning Hebrew Servants.*

An *Israelite* might in a legal way become a slave, either by *selling himself* on account of poverty, Lev. xxv. 39, 47, or by being *sold by judicial decree* on account of inability to make compensation for a theft committed, Ex. xxii. 2. In the latter case, however, we must conclude from the context of the law that it was not lawful to sell him to foreigners. On the usual view taken by almost all biblical archæologists (including Saalschütz and Keil), the creditor had a right to sell debtors or their children when they were unable to pay their debts. This view must in any case be qualified, for an *arbitrary* course of the creditor against the person and children of the debtor can have no support in the law, and would, indeed, be in decided contradiction to the *laws relating to pledges* in Deuteronomy.

The law (Deut. xxiv. 10) forbids the creditor to enter the house of the debtor in order to choose a pledge arbitrarily. It forbids him (Ex. xxii. 25 f.; Deut. xxiv. 12) to keep the pledged garment of a poor man over night; "for it is his only covering, his garment for his skin; for what can he lie on? and if he call on me, I will hear him, for I am gracious." It forbids the pledging of a debtor's mill, because that would be pledging the "soul" (that is, something indispensably requisite for the support of life), Deut. xxiv. 6. And could this humane law have given up the person of the impoverished debtor or his children to the arbitrary will of the creditor?—There is less difficulty in admitting that the lawfulness of the *judicial* adjudication of an insolvent debtor is not excluded by Lev. xxv. 39, 47. However, the passage probably only speaks of an Israelite who sells himself because he is no longer in a position to remain independent. From the other Old Testament books, also, we can deduce no sufficient proof of this common opinion. Prov. xxii. 7 does not relate to this, since the proverb expresses quite generally the dependence of the debtor on the creditor. 2 Kings iv. 1, Amos ii. 6, viii. 6, certainly prove the practice of the kingdom of the ten tribes; but the case mentioned in the first passage, that a widow's two sons were to be taken away from her by a creditor, certainly cannot be considered as agreeable to the meaning of the Mosaic law, while the passage in Amos calls it a gross offence to deliver up poor persons to slavery on account of small debts. Besides these passages, Job xxiv. 9, Neh. v. 5, Isa. l. 1, and Matt. xviii. 25 are wont to be quoted as proof-texts. The passage in Job rebukes the heartlessness which takes away as pledge a babe from the breast of its mother. With Neh. v. 5 is to be taken ver. 8, where Nehemiah condemns, in the strongest language, the mode of proceeding by which the poor were compelled to give up their children to be slaves to cover their debts. And the two last-named passages, also, are proofs only of the common practice, not of its lawfulness, which is denied also by the Rabbinic tradition (comp. Alting, *Acad. dissert.*, in Opp. V. 223).

There are *two different ordinances in the Pentateuch* concerning the *way in which an Israelite who had fallen into slavery was to be treated*,—one in the Book of the Covenant, Ex. xxi. 1-11, and Deut. xv. 12-18; and another in Lev. xxv. 39-55.

1. The first two laws make the following provisions:—(*a*) If an Israelite has bought one of his fellow country-folk, whether male or (see the passage in Deuteronomy, and Jer. xxxiv. 9 ff.) female, the time of service shall last only six years. This limitation of time, which reminds us of Jacob's seven years' service (Gen. xxix. 18), rested probably on ancient usage; in the law, however, it is made mainly in imitation of the period of the Sabbath, as is indicated in the connections of the passage in Deuteronomy. As a day of rest follows six days of labor, and a festival year follows six years of cultivation of land, so, in like manner, the seventh year shall bring to the servant freedom from bondage. Only the year of emancipation did not fall exactly at the same time as the Sabbath year; although, according to Jer. xxxiv. 8 ff., the Sabbatical year once gave occasion for the emancipation of Hebrew servants in the time [perhaps] of Zedekiah.—(*b*) If the servant entered alone into service, he became free alone; but if he entered married, his wife became free with him. If, on the contrary, his master gave him a wife, and she bear him children, the wife and children remain the master's, and he goes out free alone (1). The law in Deuteronomy commands the master to assist the freed

man with gifts of produce (from the flock, the threshing-floor, and the winepress), a provision by which the beginning of an independent support was facilitated.—(*c*) If the servant will not go free, because he loves his master or his wife and children, the master shall bring him before the court; probably for the purpose of putting the complete voluntariness of the servant's determination beyond all doubt. Then the master is to bring the servant to the door or the door-post, and pierce (רָצַע) his ear (probably the right one) with an awl, by which ceremony the servant is now bound to permanent service. According to Deut. xv. 17 a maid was to be treated in the same way. The connection in the passage in Deuteronomy shows that the door of the house in which the servant is to serve is meant, although that passage does not mention appearing before the court at all (2). As the meaning of the ceremony in general is obligation to permanent obedience, the symbolic act is applied to the organ of hearing, and that by a sign which remains forever. The affixing the ear to the door-post, caused by piercing, denotes that the servant is bound permanently to the house (3). Although a moral motive is given as the basis of this proceeding, there is undeniably something degrading in it.—The meaning of the לְעֹלָם, in Ex. xxi. 6, Deut. xv. 17, is disputed. The expression evidently refers properly to lifelong servitude (because the symbolic action ordained imprinted on the servant an indelible sign). The limitation of the time of service by the year of jubilee (so Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8. 28, and the Talmudico-Rabbinic tradition) results only from the combination with the law in Leviticus.—(*d*) In the Book of the Covenant, Ex. xxi. 7–11, a law follows which is to meet the case of an Israelite who sells his daughter to another on the presupposition that she is to become the wife or concubine of the purchaser or of his son. Here something quite different from Deut. xv. 12 ff. is spoken of; the latter law treats of the way in which a Hebrew woman is to be kept who does not enter the service of a man for the purpose of marriage (4).

Side by side with the two ordinances of the Book of the Covenant and of Deuteronomy already explained, there is one that runs quite differently, in connection with the law of the jubilee year, Lev. xxv., the contents of which are as follows: —(*a*) Vers. 39–43. Here the case is put of an Israelite selling himself to *another Israelite*, because, after parting with his possession of land, he cannot even gain a livelihood like a stranger (who earns a sustenance by working for hire). In this case the master is not to cause him to perform the work of a slave, but is rather to impose on him such work as is demanded of a day-laborer, and to treat him generally as such (5). This relation is only to last until the year of jubilee, in which the servant and his children (6) are freed, and return to their own people and the inheritance of their fathers. (Therefore a portion from the master is in this case not necessary.)—(*b*) Vers. 47–55. If, on the other hand, the impoverished Israelite sells himself to a *foreigner* dwelling in the land, he may likewise be treated only as a day-laborer, and in this case he may be redeemed at any time (7). The purchase-money is to be reckoned by the number of years which pass from the time of purchase to the year of jubilee (and the calculation is based on the amount of wages which a day-laborer can claim). In the case of redemption, the value of the service already given (calculated on the same principle) is deducted from the purchase-money. In the year of jubilee, however, the servant and his family go out quite free. Now this law in Leviticus stands, without any attempt to har-

monize them, side by side with the regulations of the Book of the Covenant and of Deuteronomy, just mentioned. Quite various views in regard to the relation in which these stand to each other have been advanced. [The attempts of the Rabbins and of Saalschütz to harmonize them, by assuming that the parallel laws refer to different persons, are a failure. According to the view of many, *e.g.* Ewald and Dillmann, the different regulations were made at different periods. According to Dillmann on Lev. xxv. 39 ff., the law in Leviticus relates to those slaves who became such by the sale of themselves through poverty, to whom, therefore, a manumission, to which they were entitled according to ancient law (Ex. xxi.), could have been of no use, because they would have returned into the same helpless condition, and who consequently voluntarily remained slaves beyond the sixth year. In regard to these the law provided that even such voluntary servitude should not continue in any case longer than up to the year of jubilee, at which time manumission and the recovery of the family inheritance would both take place. Consequently the phrase "forever" in Ex. xxi. 6 would be restricted by the law. Deuteronomy, regarding the year of jubilee as impracticable, supplies what Leviticus has in view by the recovery of one's possession, by requiring that the servant to be made free in the seventh year shall be provided for, and then consents to leave him who does not wish to be made free to be a slave for life (לְעוֹלָם, forever).] The incompleteness of the command in ver. 39 ff. is sufficiently intelligible if the provisions of the Book of the Covenant were still in force along with it. The apparent contradiction between the two laws is to be solved, with J. D. Michaelis (*Mos. Recht*, § 127), Hengstenberg (*Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 362), and others, by supposing that during the first forty-four years of a period of jubilee, the emancipation of servants was entirely regulated by the enactment in the Book of the Covenant (and so took place after six years); while, on the contrary, the year of jubilee brought freedom to those who fell into servitude in the last years of the period of the jubilee, even if they had not served for six years. Hence the law in Leviticus proceeds on the presupposition that the servant will live till the time of liberation—till the year of jubilee. [Dillmann rejects this solution of the difficulty, as irreconcilable with Lev. xxv. 40 f. But this we do not see. What other words could the law have used to express the thought which he rejects?]

(1) By the wife who does not become free is meant, of course, a slave who is not an Israelite (see the Mechilta on this passage); if she was a Hebrewess, she also had, according to Deut. v. 12, first to serve out her six years; but if she was not a Hebrewess, she had no claim whatever to be freed.

(2) [Ewald, *Antiquities of Israel*, p. 213, and Dillmann in his *Commentar*, refer the expression "go אֶל-אֱלֹהִים," to the supreme judicial court in the sanctuary, and make it relate to the door-post of the sanctuary. The latter says that the passage in Deuteronomy proves nothing against this explanation of the passage in Exodus, because in Deuteronomy nothing is said of appearing before the court.]

(3) [Dillmann, in accordance with his explanation of the door-post: "The sign signifies that the ears, *i.e.*, the obedience of this man, belong to another, he is his hearer."—The boring of the ears was, among several Oriental nations, a sign of slavery.]

(4) See Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 361; Bertheau, *The Seven Groups of the Mosaic Laws*, p. 22 ff.

§ 111.

(*b*) *The Position of Servants not Israelites.*

Slaves in the strict sense were, as we have seen from the above-mentioned passage, Lev. xxv. 44–46 (§ 109), to be acquired in part from the surrounding nations, and in part from settlers in the land. The term "nations round about" excludes the Canaanitish tribes who dwelt in the land (see Raschi on this passage); for they were to be completely exterminated (Deut. xx. 16-19). Since, however, this was not executed, but rather considerable remnants of the Canaanites remained in the land, these, so far as Israel obtained the mastery over them, were (Judg. i. 28, 30) subjected to compulsory service; just as at a previous time that "mob" (Luther's translation) which, according to Ex. xii. 38 (עֶרֶב, a mixed multitude), Num. xi. 4 (אַסַפְסֻף, a heterogeneous crowd), joined themselves to the Israelites when they were marching out of Egypt, were employed in the meaner offices in the camp (Deut. xxix. 11) (1).—For the future, also, it is ordained in the law of war (Deut. xx. 11 ff.), that the inhabitants of towns not belonging to the Canaanites who voluntarily became subject to Israel should fall into serfdom; while, on the contrary, in towns which were taken by force, the men were to be killed, and only women and children to be reduced to slavery (comp. Num. xxxi. 16 f., 26 f.). Thus was formed in the Hebrew state a sort of Helot-class, mentioned especially under David (2 Chron. ii. 17, comp. with 2 Sam. xx. 24) and Solomon (1 Kings ix. 20; 2 Chron. viii. 7). This class, which was bound to compulsory labor and employed on the public works, is estimated in 2 Chron. ii. 17 at 153,600 persons. Private slaves may have also in part been taken from this class of men. As the Old Testament never mentions the importation of slaves or slave-markets in the land, it is supposed that Israel, even in the times when it kept up a lively intercourse with other nations, drove no considerable slave-trade, and hence acquired comparatively few slaves by purchase in foreign lands. It hardly appears that Israelites came in contact with the Phœnician slave-trade otherwise than as sufferers (Joel iii. 6, Ob. 20). How little the law favored the multiplication of heathen slaves is shown by the remarkable regulation in Deut. xxiii. 16 f., in which it is said that a slave who has run away from his heathen master and fled into the land of Israel must not be delivered up nor treated with violence, but was rather to receive liberty to settle down where he pleased in an Israelitish town.—After what has been said, it cannot appear remarkable that the number of slaves in Israel was comparatively much smaller than among other civilized nations of antiquity. (See Ezra ii. 64 f., Neh. vii. 66 f., and § 189.)

The provisions of the law concerning the *religious and legal position of slaves* are as follows:—With regard to the receiving of slaves into the religious community of the covenant people by circumcision, the law of patriarchal times remained in force; see Ex. xii. 44 (comp. § 82, 3). Rabbinic tradition says that it was not lawful to compel a heathen slave to be circumcised, but he was to be resold at the end of a year if he persevered in refusing the rite. By circumcision, slaves obtained a right (according to the passage cited) to partake of the Passover; they are thus, in distinction from aliens and day-laborers (ver. 45), to be treated

as members of the family (2). That the slaves took part in the sacrificial feasts follows from this as a matter of course (Deut. xii. 12, 18, xvi. 11, 14). It was not lawful (Deut. v. 14) to interfere with the Sabbath rest of the slaves (3).—With reference to the treatment of *female slaves*, the rule laid down in Deut. xxi. 10 ff. concerning women taken in war is particularly characteristic of the humane spirit of the law.—The master has no right over the *life* of the slave. To this Ex. xxi. 20 f. refers (4). Here it is commanded that, "If a master strike his man-servant or his maid-servant with a staff, so that he or she die under his hand, it shall be avenged." [We are not with the Jewish tradition to think of the punishment of death (see Hottinger, *Juris hebr. leges*, p. 60), since what is spoken of is not intentional killing, but the abuse of the right of chastisement. The intentional killing even of one's own slave fell undoubtedly under the law, Ex. xxi. 12, Lev. xxiv. 17. Observe the antithesis in vv. 18, 21]. If, however, the slave outlived the punishment one or two days, there was to be no punishment, according to ver. 21 of the law, for "it is his money"—that is, the master is already sufficiently punished by the loss occasioned by the death of the servant. Besides, an intention to kill could not in this case be supposed. Lastly, ver. 26 f. commands that if any one strike out the eye or tooth of a slave, he must immediately give him his freedom.

The humane treatment of slaves required by the law is also inculcated elsewhere in the Old Testament. How distinctly it enjoins the recognition of human dignity in a slave is especially shown by the passage Job xxxi. 13–15: "If I did despise the cause of my man-servant or of my maid-servant, when they contended with me; what then shall I do when God riseth up? and when He visiteth, what shall I answer Him? Did not He that made me in the womb make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb?" (5).—The admonitions not to treat a slave too delicately (Prov. xxix. 19, 21) are to be regarded as parallel with those touching the training of children (6).

(1) On the class of slaves for the sanctuary, which originated in a similar way, compare § 166.

(2) As, according to Lev. xxii. 11, the slaves of a priest, like his family, might partake of the holy food.

(3) That a master who had no male issue might marry a slave to his daughter, and adopt him in the place of a son, is shown by what is related in 1 Chron. ii. 34 ff.

(4) Ex. xxi. 20 f. (see Raschi on this passage), as shown by the conclusion, treats of slaves who were not Hebrews; with regard to Israelitish slaves, the law of blood-revenge (Num. xxxv. 16 ff.) would doubtless have been observed. [*Ibid.*]

(5) Comp. Aristotle, *Eth. Nik.* viii. 13 (11): *Φιλία οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς δοῦλον ἢ δοῦλος—ὁ γὰρ δοῦλος ἔμψυχον ὄργανον· τὸ δ' ὄργανον ἄψυχος δοῦλος. Ἧι μὲν οὖν δοῦλος, οὐκ ἔστι φιλία πρὸς αὐτόν, ἢ δ' ἀνθρωπος.*—Seneca, *Epist.* v. 6 (ep. 47): "Ne tamquam hominibus quidem, sed tamquam jumentis abutimur."—In contrast: "Vis tu cogitare istum, quem servum tuum vocas, ex iisdem seminibus ortum, eodem frui cœlo, æque spirare, æque vivere, æque mori?"

(6) Comp., too, Sir. xxx. 33 ff. (xxxiii. 25 ff.).—Within the circle of Judaism, only the *Essenes* and *Therapeutæ* went so far as wholly *to abolish slavery*. They repudiated slavery as a thing unnatural, because inconsistent with the common brotherhood of mankind (see Philo, *quod omn. prob.* Mang. ii. p. 475; *de vit. contempl.* ii. p. 482).

SECOND DOCTRINE.

THE MOSAIC PUBLIC WORSHIP.

§ 112.

General Introductory Remarks. Essential Character of this Worship.

Although, in virtue of the theocratic ordinance, all human relations and conditions have a religious quality, and so the *whole life* of the Israelite must be shaped as a service paid to God, yet there exists a *special series of institutions*, forming the עֲבוֹדַת יְהוָֹה or service of Jehovah in a *narrower* sense, in which special expression is given to the *fundamental idea of the theocracy*,—that *Israel must present itself before the God who has chosen the people and brought it into fellowship with Himself as the community which He has hallowed* (Ex. xix. 4) ; that Israel must *consecrate* to God itself and all that it has. The grace shown and blessings given in connection with the acts of worship (Lev. ix. 22 ; Num. vi. 27) correspond on God's side to this devotion of the people, which rests on the divine election and institution of the covenant, and is completed in the ordinances defined by God. Note how these three elements—1. the *divine election* and *institution* in opposition to human ἐθελοθρησκεία ; 2. the *devotion* in the acts of worship ; 3. the grace connected therewith—are united in the words, Ex. xx. 24 : "In all places where I cause my name to be remembered" (viz. by offerings, as is seen from the preceding context), "I will come unto thee and bless thee." Thus in the acts of worship a *continual and lively intercourse* takes place between the congregation, drawing near to God with prayer and sacrifice, and the God who makes His presence known to it by hearing prayer and administering the good things of His grace,—a relation of mutual communication and association of life, which is designated as the coming together of God and the people, Ex. xxix. 43 f. (וְנוֹעַדְתִּי לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָּה) (1).

Since the covenant communion subsisting between God and the people is expressed in the ritual, it comes under the notion of *symbol ;* compare how אוֹת is used for the Sabbath, Ex. xxxi. 13, 17 (אוֹת הִוא בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם). The institutions of public worship must not be looked at in their bare outward form, but must be referred to the *idea* of the covenant, and interpreted from it. Since the *aim* of the covenant is contained in the words, "I am holy, and ye also shall be holy," that which is the task of the whole theocracy holds good also and especially for the ritual worship, viz. that it is to be "the representation and exercise of the process of sanctification" (2).—True, the Mosaic ritual is not a system of conscious symbol in the sense that the acts of worship were to be *merely* signs of internal things, which would thus go on in relative independence of the acts of worship. For although a comprehension of the symbols of the Mosaic worship could not be absolutely wanting to any pious Israelite, since, from the knowledge of God which was planted in Israel by revelation, a certain *understanding* of the meaning of the forms must necessarily arise—all the more so because the ceremonial law itself everywhere shows the inner side of

the demands of the law shining through the veil of outward ordinances;—though this was so, yet the outward acts of worship, as such, still remain on the *standpoint of law* the necessary vehicle for the actual realization of communion between God and man. For example, sacrifice does not symbolize a devotion to God taking place independently of the act of sacrifice; it it not *merely* a symbol, or, as has also been said, a supplement to prayer, possessing a relative necessity, but it is just the devotion of oneself to God which is *carried out* in the act of sacrifice. *The sacrifice is itself an embodied prayer;* to it is attached the attainment of divine pardon and divine blessing (of this there can be no doubt when the passages concerned are looked at without prejudice). It belongs to the *further* progress of revelation to free the spiritual contents of the act of worship from its husk (3). For the stage of infancy, the ritual ordinance has the educational value of a process working from the outside to the inside, and so awakening a God-fearing disposition, a consciousness of inward communion with God; comp. *e.g.* Deut. xiv. 22 f. (4).

(1) The view which sees in worship only an activity of man "for the awakening and enlivening of the pious consciousness" is precluded from reaching a full understanding of worship in general, and in particular of that of the Old Testament. See against this the remarks of Gaupp, *Prakt. Theol.* i. p. 83 ff. The point involved in worship is always "to find *a medium for some personal relation* and communion with God," not by any means simply to express some religious state in an artificial way for the self-satisfaction of the subject. Prayer requires a living, personal God, who *answers* prayer, and the offering of sacrifice demands its acceptance by God. Where man does not know that he has to deal with a living, personal God, all worship ends, or becomes a dead, deceptive form.—That the sacrificial side of worship is predominant in the Old Covenant, and the sacramental in the New, is due to the relation of law to gospel; in the latter, what God does for man stands first; in the former, man's acts. See Sartorius, *Ueber den alt-und neutest. Kultus*, p. 40 f.

(2) Compare Bähr's *Symbolik des mos. Kultus*, i. p. 27 ff., especially 33 f.—The Mosaic worship is viewed *merely from the outside* when, as has not seldom happened, the idea is ascribed to it that God is really to be *fed* by the offering, or when such profound interpretations are given as that of Clericus, that the incense at the sacrifice was designed to drive away impertinent flies from the flesh of the sacrifice, etc.—The worship must be understood from the *idea of the covenant.* K. J. Nitzsch has expressed himself particularly well on this topic in his academic lectures, *On Christian Theology*, 1858, which contain a series of excellent remarks on the Old Testament in opposition to current misunderstandings. He rightly says: "The whole Old Testament ought to be and must be a representation and exercise of the process of sanctification.—The whole nature of the symbols and ceremonies of Moses is *different from those of the heathen*, although much in the outer forms in heathenism and the Old Testament seems to be quite similar. The heathen ceremonies effect material union with the Divinity *ex opere operato*, and so work magically. There is not a single usage in the institutions of Moses in which communion with God is effected in a magical way through the senses, but all have a purely symbolical nature. This holds good of purifications, of offerings, of sacred buildings and their construction; it holds good of every utensil of the temple and every action."

(3) In the Prophets and the Psalms, as we shall see afterward, value is attached to sacrifice only so far as it goes along with inward acts of pious feeling, and thus it appears as relatively indifferent. Mosaism says: Piety approves itself in sacrifice; prophecy says: Sacrifice is approved only by piety. The two propositions are mutually dependent, but the question is, Which stands foremost? This

agrees with the gradual progress of the Old Testament revelation. But we must not think that, if it had not been the design of the Mosaic institutions to mirror the inner events of salvation, prophecy could have developed this thought from them.

(4) Deut. xiv. 22 f. : Bring the tithes, "that thou mayest learn to fear Jehovah thy God at all times" (comp. § 84).

§ 113.

The Place of the Word in Public Worship.

Connected with the matter of our last remarks is the peculiarity of the Mosaic worship, that in it the word, *speech, as an independent part of worship, has little prominence*, and scarcely appears except as attached to some *action* and supported thereby. The proclamation of the divine word does not appear as an essential part of the Old Testament worship ; and though the teaching of Jehovah's law and statutes, Deut. xxxiii. 10, is specified among the priest's duties (comp. § 95), the reading of the law appears in connection with worship only in the regulation in Deut. xxxi. 11 (every seventh year, at the Feast of Tabernacles). But to the place of worship was attached, without express teaching, the knowledge of the God who shows Himself there as a *present* God, Ex. xxix. 43–46, according to which, passages like Ps. xxvii. 4, etc. are to be understood ; while with the acts of worship was connected the lively *transmission of the knowledge of* the great deeds on which Israel rested its faith ; see passages like Ex. xii. 26 f., xiii. 14, etc. (comp. § 105). The *liturgical use* of the Word is found, moreover, in the middle books of the Pentateuch, and this not merely (as we often find it said) in the high priest's blessing, Num. vi. 24–26. At the festival of the day of atonement a liturgical formula is obviously presupposed, Lev. xvi. 21 ; and it is especially enjoined that at the presentation of a sin-offering (Lev. v. 5 ; Num. v. 7) a definite confession of his sin shall be made by the offerer. Vows must, as a matter of course, be *uttered*. Deuteronomy prescribes stated prayers, chap. xxvi., only on presenting the first-fruits and the tithes. Nevertheless, side by side with the established forms of worship there prevailed among the people a powerful spirit of prayer ; and so all the examples set forth in the Pentateuch are also represented as *praying men* of strong faith (1). From this spirit of prayer arose sacred *song*, which, in connection with the festival dance, was introduced into the service of worship as early as Ex. xv. 20. f., comp. with Judg. xxi. 21, but which up to the time of David appears only in perfectly free and unregulated use (2).

Appendix : The Oath.

The oath is also regarded as a religious act. See, as the main passage, Deut. vi. 13 : "Thou shalt fear Jehovah thy God ; Him shalt thou serve, and shalt swear by His name ;" comp. x. 20. Swearing is accordingly an *act of religious profession ;* comp. passages like Jer. iv. 2, Isa. xlv. 16.—The oath appears not merely as an asseveration,—as the assertion of the truth before the *presence* of God as the Living One (in the formula חַי יהוה, "Jehovah lives," see § 42),

and hence as the omnipotent, omniscient, and holy avenger of untruth—so, *e.g.*, Judg. xi. 10 ("May Jehovah be judge between us"); but it is a distinct *appeal to His penal justice* against him who knowingly speaks falsehood. This conception of the oath is sufficiently evident even from the common form of swearing with אִם and אִם לֹא which, fully expressed, demands a sentence of the sort which we find in 2 Sam. iii. 35: כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה-לִּי אֱלֹהִים וְכֹה יֹסִיף (if this and that is or is not so); comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 24. But this character of the oath is particularly clear in the main passage Josh. xxii. 22; "אֵל אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אֵל אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה knows, and Israel shall know, if it be in rebellion, or in transgression against Jehovah, save us not this day;" and ver. 23: "Let Jehovah Himself require it." The oath, viewed as such an appeal to God's penal justice, bears the name אָלָה, or more fully שְׁבֻעַת אָלָה, Num. v. 21, with which passage compare also Deut. xxix. 13, 18, Prov. xxix. 24, etc. Therefore Solomon, in his prayer at the dedication of the temple, 1 Kings viii. 31 f., prays that the effect of an אָלָה presented at the altar may be, that God in heaven may hear, act, and judge, to condemn the godless, to bring his way on his head, and to justify the righteous, and give him according to his righteousness.—The oath appears in *private life* from the most ancient times as a *promissory* oath, Gen. xxiv. 2 f., l. 5, 25; in particular, as an *oath of covenant*, xxi. 23 ff., xxxi. 53 f. The law speaks of promissory oaths, particularly in the form of vows (see § 143 f.). The law still further acknowledges the *assertory* oath as an *oath of purgation before the court of justice*, Ex. xxii. 11, and as an adjuration by the judge to those who were present and in a position to bear witness, Lev. v. 1 (comp. § 99). To this head belongs also the adjuration of those accused of adultery, Num. v. 19 ff. (comp. §104, 1).—The *form* in which an oath was taken was always that the oath was *sworn by Jehovah* (חַי יְהוָה). Protestations by the soul (חַי נַפְשְׁךָ) and the like are matters of private caprice, and not of theocratic rules. Custom combined various signs with the taking of an oath; thus, in Gen. xxi. 28 ff., seven lambs were set up as pledges of the oath,—much as, according to Herodotus, iii. 8, the Arabians closed a bargain by smearing seven stones with the blood of the contracting parties. The word נִשְׁבַּע, to swear, properly to *be-seven* one another, points to the great age of such customs. The variously interpreted patriarchal ceremony in swearing, viz. laying the hand under the thigh of him who is sworn to, Gen. xxiv. 2, xlvii. 29, is probably to be explained by the fact that the thigh was regarded as the source of physical life. It was doubtless still more common to raise the hand in invocation toward heaven (4), Gen. xiv. 22 f., comp. with Deut. xxxii. 40, Ex. vi. 8. The official and *judicial* form of oath among the Hebrews was, that he who administered the oath conjured the man who was to swear, who then answered the adjuration with אָמֵן (comp. Num. v. 22; Deut. xxxvii. 16 ff.), or, "thou sayest it," Matt. xxvi. 63 f. (in the mouth of Jesus).

Perjury, as a profanation of Jehovah's name (Lev. xix. 12), as a vain use of it Ex. xx. 7), is a heavy sin. How sacred, swearing was counted is shown by Josh. ix. 19, where even an unlawful obligation contracted by oath is held to, in order that God's wrath (קֶצֶף) may not come on the community. Even an asseveration frivolously spoken was to be atoned for by a sin-offering, Lev. v. 4 ff. When, in Lev. v. 21 ff. [E. V. vi. 2 ff.], a man who has denied upon oath the pos-

session of a deposit, or otherwise has used an oath to conceal a breach of trust, is sentenced only to restore the amount of his breach of trust, with the addition of one fifth more, and then to bring a trespass-offering, the apparent lightness of this punishment is probably to be explained by assuming that the law refers only to the case of voluntary confession of perjury.—In the later books of the Old Testament, compare, with reference to the sacredness of the oath, Ps. xv. 4; 1 Kings viii. 31 f.; Ezek. xvii. 16 ff. (with reference to Zedekiah, comp. § 186) (3).

(1) Formal directions for prayer are altogether omitted in the Pentateuch; *examples of prayer* are, however, given, and answers to prayer are recounted: Jacob's wrestling; Moses' uplifted hands at the battle with Amalek; his mediatorial intercession for the people before God—such types are presented from which every one can draw the knowledge of God's will: "Call on me in trouble," etc.

(2) According to Judg. xxi. 21, virgins went in such dances to the yearly festival in Shiloh.

(3) Ps. xv. 4, "He sweareth to his hurt, and changeth not," must be explained by referring the passage to Lev. v. 4.—It is noteworthy how the Rabbins combine strictness and laxity in the doctrine of oaths. Thus Maimonides, *Hilchoth shebuoth* xi. 16, ed. Dithmar, p. 204 (comp. the passage from the *Shulchan aruch* in Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfassung der heutigen Juden*, p. 364) teaches, on the one hand, that the Jew who swears ought to remember that the whole world quaked in the hour when God said to Moses, "Thou shalt not take the name of thy God in vain." Perjury does not concern the transgressor alone, but his whole race—indeed all Israel, etc. But what wretched casuistry does Maimonides develop, on the other hand, in the same book! what lax usage do the provisions of the Rabbins on compulsory oaths permit! Comp. my article, "Kol Nidre," in Herzog's *R.E.* viii. p. 24 f.

I. THE PLACE OF WORSHIP (1).

§ 114.

The Requisites for a Place of Worship.

The simplest place of worship is the *altar*, which is first mentioned, Gen. viii. 20; a *height rising toward heaven*, signifying the ascent of the devotion embodied in sacrifice (2). The common name for the altar, מִזְבֵּחַ, designates it as the *place of sacrifice*. The first condition for a place of worship is, that it *has been chosen and sanctified by God*, and has *actually been witnessed to as the place of His revelation*. As already in the time of the *patriarchs* altars were set up chiefly in places consecrated by theophanies, Gen. xii. 7, xxvi. 24 f. (compared with xxviii. 18, xxxv. 1, 14), so, according to *Mosaic* law, only that place is permitted to be a place of worship where God has established the memory of His name, Ex. xx. 24; which He has *chosen to cause His name to dwell there*, Deut. xii. 5, 11 (xiv. 23) (comp. § 56); which He fills with His glory (Ex. xl. 34), and thereby sanctifies (xxix. 43 f.)—as it is afterward said of the temple (1 Kings ix. 3; 2 Chron. vii. 16), that His eyes and His heart were there.

The sanctuary is to be *one* only, that the people may be kept together in theocratic unity. Later experience shows how a multiplicity of places for the ordinances of worship aided the growth of idol-worship. The exclusive unity of the

national sanctuary is implied (not only in Deuteronomy, but) already in what is said in the book of Exodus concerning the tabernacle as Jehovah's dwelling-place. The passage Ex. xx. 24 f., "In *every place* where I place a memorial of my name," etc., is not contradictory, for this passage does not give leave to worship Jehovah at the same time in many places; but the meaning is, that an altar of earth is to be reared up to God *always in that place* in which God has placed a memorial of His name. A number of places is only spoken of so far as the seat of worship necessarily varied with the people's place of residence, as long as they were on their wanderings (3). The unity of the sanctuary is further presupposed in the prohibition, given for the wandering in the wilderness (Lev. xvii. 1 ff.) (4), against killing an animal belonging to the class of sacrificial animals anywhere except at the sanctuary. The command, however, is most distinctly given in connection with the settlement of the nation in the Holy Land, in Deut. xii.; permitting, indeed, the killing of animals for food in every place, but *limiting every sacrifice* to that place which Jehovah shall choose for the habitation of His name. Nevertheless, Deut. xii. 8 indicates that, even during the wandering in the wilderness, the prohibition of other places of worship was not fully carried into effect (5).

(1) Since the persons charged with the conduct of the Mosaic worship have already been treated of, we have in particular only to treat of three other points :— 1. Of the *seat* of worship; 2. of the *acts* of worship; and 3. of the *times* of worship.—Comp. Bähr, *Symbolik des mos. Kultus.*

(2) The Greek βωμός also primarily signifies a height = בָּמָה, but in the Old Testament this is the name for illegal high places for sacrifice. [See further concerning the בָּמוֹת in Baudissin, ii. p. 255 ff., and his art. "Hohendienst" in Herzog, 2d. ed.]

(3) [So also Bredenkamp, p. 130, in agreement with Delitzsch. On the other hand, Wellhausen, i. p. 30 : "A multiplicity of altars is recognized (here) not merely as admissible, but as a matter of course;" and Dillmann, *Comm.* : "The author allows altars to Jehovah to be erected everywhere in the land." In any case the passage forbids the arbitrary erection of altars; for the words "in all places where I record my name" are not invalidated by the remark of Wellhausen, that "this signifies nothing more than that they did not like to consider that the places where intercourse between heaven and earth had occurred were arbitrarily chosen, but regarded them as somehow provided by the Deity Himself for their worship" (p. 31).

(4) [Comp. on this passage, Bredenkamp, p. 132 ff. Dillmann remarks : "To predicate a post-Deuteronomic or still farther, a post-exilic origin of this composition is downright nonsense; for it could never occur to the framer of a law, who had Deut. xii. 15 ff. and xv. 22 f. before him as recognized law, to enact a provision like that in Lev. xvii. 3–7 with the addition of ver. 7 b."]

(5) [The denial of the historical reality of the tabernacle, by the critics, has been already referred to in § 29, note 1, and § 33, note 3. The question in respect to the *place* of worship forms one of the principal subjects of critical discussion at present. That in the account of the tabernacle in Exodus the thought of the unity of worship is expressed, and that it is conceived of as the *only* legitimate place of worship, is acknowledged. The question concerning the origin of the tabernacle is therefore partly coincident with the question, when the requirement of unity of worship was made. For Wellhausen's view (i. p. 17 ff.), see § 29, note 1. With him agrees Reuss (§ 380) : "For us and for every sober thinker the tabernacle is a pure fiction." Similarly H. Schultz, p. 375, regards the tabernacle in Exodus as an ideal of the sanctuary, made after the pattern of Solomon's temple, as this was to be made in Israel according to the wish of the creator of this ideal; yet this ideal belonged perhaps to the age of Ezekiel, and did not orig-

inate in the post-exilic period. Views akin to this are adopted by Kittel, *Theol. Studien aus Württemberg*, ii. p. 33 ff., and Baudissin, art. "Hohendienst," p. 185 ff. These writers appear to be supported by Nöldeke's view, *Unters. z. Krit. d. A. T.*, p. 127, that, "as soon as Solomon's temple was built, a strong tendency toward unity of worship must have sprung up." Hence they are inclined to make the idea of the tabernacle in Exodus to have arisen before the age of Deuteronomy, which is brought down to the time of Josiah, or nearly contemporaneously with it. On the other hand, the real existence of a Mosaic central sanctuary, although not precisely the historical truth of all the details of the account in Exodus, is defended by Dillmann, *Comm. z. Exod.* p. 269 ff.; Delitzsch, in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, 1880, and Bredenkamp (chap. iii.); comp. also the remarks of F. W. Schultz in Zöckler's *Handbuch*, i. p. 243 f.

The argument that the Israelites in the wilderness could never have executed a work like the tabernacle is not decisive. For who to-day is able to determine what the Israelites could or could not have taken with them from Egypt, or how much individual Israelites understood of the mechanical arts? The difficulty lies in the fact that, not only from the time of the Judges onward was sacrifice offered at very different places, but that the multiplicity of places does not appear, at all events, as illegal. Samuel offered sacrifices now here and now there. That Saul built an altar to the Lord is not mentioned in 1 Sam. xiv. 35 in the way of censure. David received, through the prophet Gad, the command to build to the Lord an altar on the threshing-floor of Araunah (2 Sam. xxiv. 18). That the worship in high places was observed, is expressly stated in 1 K. iii. 2, and is there excused, "because there was no house built unto the name of the Lord."

On the other hand, Josh. xx. shows that the West-Jordan tribes resisted an attempt of those on the east of the Jordan to establish a worship of their own. Wellhausen, indeed, finds also in this narrative the aim which characterizes the priests' codex (p. 39). But even supposing that the narrative was colored by design, would there not lie at the foundation the memory of a conflict occasioned by the schismatic efforts of the East-Jordan tribes? Moreover, in the passage concerning Eli, 1 Sam. 2, 28 ff., only "*one* altar, *one* place of worship, and *one* legitimate priesthood, are spoken of" (Brekenkamp). Wellhausen is able to get rid of this passage only by claiming that it is "Deuteronomy-wise colored." When Jeremiah (vii. 12) calls Shiloh "my place where I set my name at the first," this appears to show that it was known in the time of Jeremiah, that Shiloh once had a similar signification for Israel, which Jerusalem with the temple had in his day. Comp. the whole connection of the passage, particularly v. 14. It is especially worthy of notice, that the old book of the covenant, Ex. 23, 17, requires that all the men should each year assemble before Jehovah, which in all probability points to a central sanctuary. For the solution of the difficulty, §§ 158–160 will be found helpful. Comp. also the remarks of Delitzsch in his art. "Opfer," in Riehm, p. 115 f.]

§ 115.

The Arrangement of the Mosaic Sanctuary (1).

The Mosaic sanctuary was a tent, generally called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד—that is, not, as many modern critics falsely interpret it, *tent of the gathering* of the people, but *tent of the meeting of God with the people*, as unequivocally appears from the definite explanations, Ex. xxix. 42 f. (אֲשֶׁר אִוָּעֵד לָכֶם שָׁמָּה לְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ שָׁם . . . אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, etc.) Num. xvii. 4, comp. with Ex. xxv. 22, xxx. 6 (2). The other name for the sanctuary, אֹהֶל הָעֵדוּת, or מִשְׁכַּן הָעֵדוּת—that is, *tent* or *dwelling of the testimony*—denotes the sanctuary as *the place of revelation*. The LXX render both expressions by σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου or τῆς μαρτυρίας: the Vulgate generally gives *tabernaculum fœderis*, and from the latter arises Luther's *Stiftshütte*.

The *framework* of the tent formed by a construction of gilded boards or (probably more correctly) *beams* (קְרָשִׁים). The wood of the Arabic acacia (שִׁטָּה, probably different from ours) was selected for this purpose, as well as for the sacred utensils, doubtless because, besides being very light, it is distinguished by unusual durability. Over the wooden frame there hung, Ex. xxvi. 1–14, a fourfold covering of curtains, the first of which was made of byssus (probably fine linen), embroidered with pictures of cherubs. The frame with this first covering is called מִשְׁכָּן, in the narrower sense. The entrance to the tent was turned toward the east, and hung with a costly covering (מָסָךְ) made of byssus. The whole tent—the length of which was thirty cubits, and its breadth ten—was divided into two rooms: in front, the *Holy Place*, הַקֹּדֶשׁ, twenty cubits long; and behind this the *Most Holy Place*, קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים, in length ten cubits, and separated from the former by a *curtain* woven with pictures of cherubim, called the פָּרֹכֶת (separation). The tabernacle was surrounded on all sides by a *court*, in length one hundred cubits and in breadth fifty, which was formed by pillars and curtains, and had, instead of a door, a curtain twenty cubits broad.—The *utensils* of the sanctuary were as follows:—In the *court*, in the open air, stood the *altar for burnt-offerings* (Ex. xxvii. 1 ff.), מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה, which is always meant when the altar is spoken of absolutely: it was a frame of acacia boards, overlaid with copper. As the command xx. 24 f., which required the altar to be made out of earth or unhewn stones, was not abrogated (comp. Deut. xxvii. 5 f.; Josh. viii. 31), we must doubtless suppose the altar to have been a mere frame without a top, which served simply to enclose the real altar, consisting of earth or unhewn stones. At the four corners of the altar were heights, called *horns*, on which a part of the blood was smeared at the sin-offerings, and which were laid hold of by those who sought a refuge at the altar; comp. *e.g.* 1 Kings i. 50, etc. The height of the altar was three cubits; it was surrounded half-way up by a grating (כַּרְכֹּב), in order probably to let the priest go round the altar on it. Between the altar and the sanctuary was a copper *washing-basin*, כִּיּוֹר, in which the priests washed their hands and feet before going to the duties of their office, Ex. xxx. 17 ff. *In the sanctuary itself*, toward the north, stood the table with the *twelve loaves of shewbread*, לֶחֶם פָּנִים (Ex. xxv. 23–30), which were prepared from fine flour without leaven, and put there new every Sabbath. Opposite the table stood *a golden candlestick with seven lamps*, with bowls in the form of almonds and knops (כַּפְתֹּרִים), probably in the form of a pomegranate, vers. 31–40. In the middle, before the curtain leading to the most holy place, was the *altar of incense*, מִזְבַּח מִקְטָר, overlaid with gold plate. *In the Most Holy Place* stood *the ark of the covenant*, אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית, also called ark of the testimony, אֲרוֹן הָעֵדוּת, also simply עֵדוּת, the most sacred vessel of the sanctuary,—a chest overlaid within and without with fine gold, containing *the tables of the law*, and covered with a golden plate called כַּפֹּרֶת (*kapporeth*), the most important part of the ark of the covenant (see in particular, Lev. xvi. 13 ff.), from which, 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, the Holiest of all bore the name בֵּית הַכַּפֹּרֶת. The term does not, as many modern critics understand, signify a lid in general; but being a derivative from Piël, כִּפֶּר, it is to be understood to mean *an instrument of atonement* [Eng. version, *mercy seat*], as the Septuagint correctly translates it, ἱλαστήριον. Above the kapporeth stood two golden *cherubim*, with outspread

wings and faces turned toward each other; between them the *shekhina* of Jehovah was supposed to be (Ex. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 89). Hence Jehovah is called יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים (1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; Ps. xcix. 1). The poles for bearing the ark (בַּדִּים) were always to remain in the rings which were on its sides, because it was not to be touched by the hand of man; neither was it to be seen, and therefore before it was carried farther it had to be covered with the curtain and rolled up, Num. iv. 5 f. Besides this, a vessel with manna (Ex. xvi. 33), Aaron's rod that budded (Num. xvii. 25), and lastly, by the side of the ark of the covenant, the book of the law (Deut. xxxi. 26), were kept in the most holy place.

(1) Old Testament Theology may here limit itself to what relates to the symbolic signification of the sanctuary, and leave other investigation to archæology.—Comp. Bähr, *l.c.*; Kurtz, "Beiträge zur Symbolik des alttest. Kultus, erster Beitrag: zur Symbolik der Kultusstätte" (*Zeitschr. für luth. Theol.* 1851, p. 1 ff.). The best essay on this point is that of Riggenbach, *Die mosaische Stiftshütte*, 1862 (ed. 2, 1867). [Comp. also Köhler, i. 364 ff., where the literature of the subject is still further given; also E. E. Atwater, *The Sacred Tabernacle of the Hebrews*, N. Y., 1875.—D.]

(2) The essential character of the Old Testament worship is expressed in this designation (comp. § 112).

§ 116.

Meaning of the Sanctuary. Its Three Rooms.

The *symbolic interpretation of the sanctuary* cannot, as has frequently been done, proceed from a comparison with a common nomadic tent; because, of the three rooms of the latter, the central is the chief, while, on the contrary, in the three divisions of the tabernacle, we easily observe, along with a graduated relation of size, a graduated relation also in respect to their importance. Into the first division, the court, only the covenant people can go; into the second, only the priesthood; into the third, the high priest alone, and that only once a year. The first division is under the open sky; the second is veiled, but still lighted; the third is quite veiled and dark.—The notion that the sanctuary is *an image of the universe* is old, occurring even in Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 6. 4) and Philo. The same view has been again brought forward by Bähr (*Symbolik des mosaischen Kultus*, i.) in a peculiar form and an ingenious way: the most holy place and the holy place form a representation of heaven; the court, a representation of earth (1). But this conception is inconsistent with the fact that everything that is said about the sanctuary makes it to refer simply to the *theocratic relation* of Jehovah to His elect people, while the cosmical meaning is nowhere intimated; for such a conception certainly does not necessarily lie in the square form of the building. In what sense a relation between the sanctuary and heaven is to be admitted will appear below. The sanctuary is, as it is called, *the tent of the meeting of God and the people;* but this in the sense that here the people come to Jehovah in His dwelling-place, which He has established in the midst of His people. Accordingly, in the sanctuary is embodied the *idea of God's dwelling among the people of Israel.* It is a *tent;* because Jehovah, who accompanies His people in their wanderings [comp. 2 Sam. vii. 6 f.], aims, in respect to His dwelling-place, to place Himself

in similar circumstances with them. But at the same time, the people are to be made conscious, that although the Holy God condescends to dwell among His people, yet, on account of the people's sinfulness, this communion cannot be accomplished directly, but only through the mediation of the people's intercessor, who holds the office of reconciliation. The people are therefore limited to the *court* surrounding the sanctuary, and the sanctuary itself is only allowed to be entered by the priests. But even these priests are not in a position to establish a full communion with God (comp. Heb. ix. 8). For this reason Jehovah's dwelling-place is divided into two apartments: the veiled, *holiest of all*, in which Jehovah, the revealed, and yet hidden, and in a manner unapproachable God (comp. 1 Kings viii. 12), is enthroned in the darkness; and the *holy place*,—the place of the priests and their service, which on this account is the symbol of the mediation of the covenant. There is a relation between the sanctuary and heaven so far as this, that the shekhina in the latter corresponds to the shekhina in the former (see § 62); indeed, it is not impossible that the distinction between the heaven (שָׁמַיִם) and the heaven of heavens (שְׁמֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם), which occurs several times in the Old Testament, corresponds to the difference between the holy place (קֹדֶשׁ) and the most holy place (קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים). Ex. xxv. 9, 40, has also been appealed to in support of this, comp. Heb. viii. 5; still the statement, that the model of the tabernacle and its vessels was shown to Moses on the mount, does not in itself imply that the sanctuary was to be a copy of a celestial original, but only that it served to *give expression to the ideas of revelation*. There is, moreover, a *contrast* between the two divine dwelling-places; for in heaven God dwells in His majesty as Ruler of the world,—in the earthly tabernacle He dwells in His condescending grace.

(1) Bähr subsequently modified this view in his work on Solomon's temple, 1848 [and in the second edition of his *Symbolik* presented a view nearly like that here given. He regards the tabernacle as God's dwelling among His people, and consequently as a sign and pledge of His kingly authority and of His communication by revelation with His people, but also at the same time as a figurative representation of the literal dwelling of God, viz. heaven, but not the vault of heaven].

§ 117.

Continuation: Sacred Vessels in the Court and in the Sanctuary.

The meaning of the various sacred vessels corresponds to the meaning of the three divisions of the sanctuary. The only piece of sacred furniture with reference to which an immediate *activity of the people* takes place, viz. the *altar of burnt offering*, stands in the *court*. The fact that nothing but *earth* or *unhewn stone* was to be used to fill up the frame is not (as Bähr says) meant to remind us that man is a creature of the earth, and a sinner subject to death,—for how could the unhewn stones signify this?—but the material is to be one which is *as yet not desecrated by the hand of man*.—The *horns* on the four corners of the altar are very variously interpreted. On one view (held, among others, by Riggenbach, and Keil, *Archäologie*, i. pp. 104, 229), they were symbols of the divine power of salvation and help, because, as is well known, the horns of a bull are the symbol of strength,

and with this view it well agrees that to them especially the idea of asylum was attached. According to another view, which agrees better with the use of the horns in the sacrificial service, the general meaning of the altar (that worship *ascends* to God) *culminates* in the horns, so that thus the blood of atonement sprinkled on them is, as it were, brought *a step nearer* God (1). On account of the importance of the horns, the altar is destroyed by knocking them off, Amos iii. 14.—The *washing-basin*, כִּיּוֹר, marks *the passing from the general offering of sacrifice to the specific priestly service.* When the priests, Ex. xxx. 21, are commanded to purify hands and feet, with the warning that else they must die, this is meant to signify that he *who has to carry on the service of reconciliation* for the congregation must *sanctify his own walk and acts.*

In the *holy place* stands the *altar of incense*, in *front of the inner curtain*, and *so opposite the ark of the covenant*, the place of the shekhina of God veiled by the curtain. The incense-offering, presented here every morning and evening by the hand of the priest, was (see Ps. cxli. 2; Rev. v. 8, viii. 3 f.) a *symbol of the prayers of the people*, because of which in the temple at a later time (comp. Luke i. 10) during the time of the priestly offering of incense, a praying congregation *was gathered in the court.* In Num. xvii. 11 (xvi. 46), the burning of incense is an emblem of the intercession of the high priest.—It is more difficult to see the meaning of the *table with the shewbread.* The לֶחֶם פָּנִים is so called, Ex. xxv. 30, evidently because it was laid continually *before* Jehovah; and hence the table, Num. iv. 7, bore the name שֻׁלְחַן הַפָּנִים. [Bähr, who in the 1st ed. of his *Symbolik*, i. p. 425 ff., explains "bread of the countenance" as meaning bread by the use of which man obtains the sight of God, interprets it in the 2d ed. as a sign and pledge that all that pertains to the life of Israel (daily bread in the sense of the petition in the Lord's prayer), comes from the presence of Jehovah, and hence that Jehovah has turned his face to Israel.]

But in Lev. xxiv. 8, the shewbread is designated as something *given on the part of* (מֵאֵת) *the children of Israel* as an "eternal *covenant*"—that is, a pledge of the eternal covenant to be given by Israel (2). In the same way, this whole oblation comes within the class of *food-offerings*, in virtue of the incense which was sprinkled on the bread as אַזְכָּרָה (ver. 7). That the shewbread is akin to the food-offering becomes still more clear, because, according to Ex. xxv. 29 f., Num. iv. 7, to the utensils of the shewbread belonged also those vessels which were used for drink-offerings. The meaning of the shewbread rather is, that the people in its twelve tribes testifies by the continual presentation of nourishing bread in the sanctuary that it owes to the blessing of its God the maintenance of life; thereby Israel dedicates to God the exercise of the calling by which it wins its daily bread in the use of God's gifts (3).—Since Philo's time, the *candlestick with the seven lamps* has often been referred to the seven *planets* of the ancients. But though the sanctity of the number seven may have had this reference in some other nations, there is no trace of this in the Mosaic worship. The number seven is here always the sign of *perfection* and *completion* in all relations which are rooted in the divine economy of salvation. But while, in general, all holy things symbolize the communion between Jehovah and the people, the candlestick with its sevenfold light points to the *perfect Light* which shines in this covenant community; and in particular, the light does not refer merely to the communication of higher knowledge,

but, as in the high priest's blessing, Num. vi. 25 ("Jehovah make His face shine upon thee"), to *saving divine grace in general.* This meaning of the symbol is specially confirmed by the visions Zech. iv. and Rev. i. ff. There the candlestick is the symbol of a congregation enlightened by God; and when, in the vision of Zechariah, the candlestick is filled with oil without the act of man, the idea expressed is, as is said in ver. 6, that all the success and all the splendor of the congregation is not effected by might or by power, but by the Spirit of God.—*Almond blossoms and pomegranates*, the ornaments of the candlestick, are, in the heathenism of Western Asia, symbols of natural life (4.) If, now, in Num. xvii. 16–24, the blossoming almond-rod is the symbol of the inexhaustible power of divine life in the priesthood of Aaron (comp. § 95), those ornamentations on the golden candlestick are also to be regarded as the symbol of the divine fulness of life which the congregation shares in communion with God. *Light and life* are, to speak generally, essentially connected ideas in Holy Writ; comp. in particular Ps. xxxvi. 9: "With Thee is the fountain of life; and in Thy light we shall see light." In the symbols of the *holy place* the truth is expressed, that the people presents itself before its God in the light and life which it receives in virtue of covenant communion with God.

(1) Thus Hofmann, who regards the horns as "the peaks of the sacred height" (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 257), etc. I hold the latter explanation to be the more probable. Gen. xvii. 11, 13.

(2) Comp. how the same term is used of circumcision, § 87.

(3) This interpretation is carried further by Hengstenberg and others, who make the shewbread a symbol of spiritual nourishment, which the people has produced and now presents to its God as a service in accordance with the covenant—in other words, a symbol of good works; an interpretation which is reached by bringing in John vi. 27 ("labor not for the meat which perisheth," etc.), comp. with iv. 32 ff., but has no support in the Old Testament.

(4) Especially the almond blossom, because it wakes into bloom while all nature is still asleep.

§ 118.

Continuation: The Ark of the Covenant, with the Kapporeth and the Tables of the Law.

In the most holy place, the ark of the covenant is the symbol and vehicle of the *presence of the revelation of Jehovah among his people.* Hence it is called the *throne* of God, Jer. iii. 16 f.; God's *footstool*, 1 Chron. xxviii. 2, Ps. xcix. 5, cxxxii. 7. But its meaning is more nearly defined by the three parts—the *kapporeth* [*mercy seat*] *on the ark*, the *tables of the law in it*, and the *cherubim over it.*

1. The *kapporeth* is the most important part of the ark of the covenant. To it specially is attached the manifestation of the divine presence; "there," it is said in Ex. xxv. 22, "will I meet with thee, and will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat," etc. In the circumstance that it is the *instrument of atonement* (comp. § 115), and that it is at the kapporeth that the highest act of atonement is executed, it is expressed that the God who dwells in the midst of His people can only commune with them in virtue of an atonement offered to Him, but that He is also a God who can be reconciled. This throne of God is veiled in deep darkness, 1 Kings viii. 12 ("Jehovah hath said that he will dwell in darkness");

the manifestation of God over the kapporeth takes place in a cloud, which veils His glory, Lev. xvi. 2,—in the same cloud which guided Israel's march through the wilderness, Ex. xiii. 21, and which, Ex. xl. 34–38, lowered itself on the tabernacle when it was set up. Notwithstanding this, on the day of atonement, the priest who approaches with the blood of atonement must envelope himself in a cloud of incense (Lev. xvi. 13) when he raises the curtain (1). This expresses the fact that full communion between God and man is not to be realized, even through the medium of the atonement to be attained by the Old Testament sacrificial institutions—that, as is said in Heb. ix. 8, as yet the way to the (heavenly) sanctuary was not made manifest (*μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν*).

2. The kapporeth rests on the ark, in which are the *tables of the law*, the testimony, עֵדוּת. This means that God sits enthroned in Israel on the ground of the covenant of law which He has made with Israel. The testimony is preserved in the ark as a *treasure*, a jewel (2). But with this goes a *second* consideration (3); while the law is certainly, in the first place, a testimony to the will of God *toward* the people, it is also (comp. what is said in Deut. xxxi. 26 f. of the roll of the law deposited beside the ark of the covenant) a testimony *against* the sinful people,—a continual record of accusation, so to speak, against their sins in the sight of the holy God. And now, when the kapporeth is over the tables, it is declared that God's grace, which provides an atonement or covering for the iniquity of the people, stands above His penal justice.

(1) The passage Lev. xvi. 2, so variously interpreted, runs thus: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil before the mercy-seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not: for I appear in the cloud" (and so veiled) "upon the mercy-seat." For a long time it was the current exegesis (Vitringa, *Observ. sacr.* i. p. 168 ff., Bähr, Ewald) to identify the בֶּעָנָן in ver. 2 with the cloud of incense in ver. 13 (comp. § 140), so that ver. 2*b* should be explained: "that he may not die; for only in the cloud"—produced by the incense—"do I appear over the kapporeth." The unnaturalness of this paraphrase is manifest. I hold that view to be the right one which regards the two clouds (עָנָן) as different. But this leaves it a disputed point what the first עָנָן is to be supposed to be. The Rabbins say, a cloud which continually hung over the cherubim; Luther, on the contrary, on Ps. xviii. (xvii.) 11, observes: "Super propitiatorium et cherubim nihil erat positum, quod videretur, sed sola fide credebatur illic sedere Deus" (*Exeget. opera lat.* xvi. p. 73). Hofmann's explanation is the most probable (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 507 f.), who identifies the cloud (correctly pointed with the article) with that mentioned in Ex. xl. It was to appear over the kapporeth whenever the high priest came before it.

(2) This is the primary meaning, as to which I hold that Bähr and Kurtz are right.

(3) Hengstenberg has wrongly represented this as the only meaning of the symbol.

§ 119.

Continuation: The Cherubim (1).

3. The *cherubim* are one of the most important symbols of the Mosaic worship. Figures of them appear also on the tapestry of the tabernacle, and, at a later time, on the walls of Solomon's temple, and in the vision of the new temple, Ezek. xli.

They are mentioned first in Gen. iii. 24,—a fact which, as Hengstenberg and others have rightly remarked, indicates that they belonged to a symbolism earlier than that of Mosaism (2). In Ps. xviii. 11 they appear as bearers of the cloudy chariot on which Jehovah rides; they are, besides, mentioned in the vision of Ezekiel, x. 1 ff. comp. with i. 4 ff., in which latter passage they are called חַיּוֹת, *i.e.* living creatures, as in Rev. iv. 6 ff. the ζῶα (3). They nowhere appear developed into independent personality, like the מַלְאָכִים [angels]; they are not sent out like these, but are constantly confined to the seat of the divine habitation and the manifestation of the Divine Being; this also holds good of Gen. iii. (comp. § 62). In Ezekiel, where their form is the most complicated (comp. Rev. iv.), they appear with a fourfold face,—that of a *man*, a *lion*, a *bull*, and an *eagle*, —with four wings, two of which are used in flying while the other two cover the body, and with arms and feet; their whole body is covered with eyes. This *description of Ezekiel's is not to be transferred to the cherubim of the sanctuary;* in fact, there would not (as Riehm rightly remarks) have been room on the ark of the covenant for a form so complicated. Neither can the cherubim of the temple have been so complicated. For since, according to 1 Kings vii. 29, 36, there were figures of lions and bulls beside the cherubim on the brazen bases in the temple of Solomon, these cannot have been contained in the figures of the cherubim; nevertheless, the addition of the former shows that they stand in some relation to the cherubim. But we must further note (as Hengstenberg has rightly indicated), that in 1 Kings vi. 29 palms and open flowers, and palms again in Ezek. xli. 18 ff., appear in connection with the cherubim. But if, even in Ezek. i. 5, the human form is to be regarded as predominant, this is still more the case with the cherubim in the Pentateuch, to whom hands (Gen. iii. 24) and faces (Ex. xxv. 20) are ascribed. The cited Pentateuchal passages lead, indeed (as Riehm and Keil rightly assert), to nothing further than to winged human forms (4). But it is not at all probable that Ezekiel was the first to add all the other features; some form or other akin to the later composition, although simpler, is probably to be assumed for the ancient symbols (5). According to Hengstenberg (*The books of Moses and Egypt*) and others, the cherubim of the Pentateuch are to be regarded as imitations of the Egyptian sphinxes, which are composed of the form of a human being (not merely a virgin, but oftener still a man) combined with that of a lion, to which Ezekiel, in whose portraiture a relation to the Assyrian composite figures of animals cannot be mistaken, has added also the bull and the eagle. The cherubim are in any case to be so interpreted, that the latest form in Ezekiel shall be taken only as a development of what originally was involved in the symbol.

Our inquiry into the *meaning* of the cherubim must start from the fact that, as has been already remarked, they designate a place as the abode of the habitation of God (Paradise, the tabernacle, and later the temple), and are thus the bearers of the manifestation of God when He manifests Himself to the world in His glory; on which account they are called God's chariot (1 Chron. xxviii. 18, comp. Ps. xviii. 11). Since, now, in Gen. iii. 24 they bar the entrance to Paradise, and since in Ex. xxv. 20 they protect and shade the ark, the first element in their function is to express to man's consciousness the *inaccessibility* of the Divine Being. They reflect the glory of the unapproachable God in a form which

is accessible for human eyes, but at the same time is so constructed (as Riehm rightly urges) that they could give no support to the worship of images. But in admitting this, we have not yet done full justice to the symbol, especially in its most developed form. By uniting in itself the noblest earthly living creatures, —man, the eagle, the lion, the bull,—and connecting with them also flowers and palms as representatives of the vigor of life that displays itself in the vegetable kingdom, the symbol is evidently meant more particularly to set forth *the divine glory as it is manifested in the world*, and thereby to teach men to know the vital powers which work in the world as the efflux of the divine glory. It is the cherubim, as Schultz (*Alttest. Theologie*, p. 575) well expresses it, "which at one and the same time *proclaim* and *veil* His presence." The lion and the bull are, as is well known, symbols of power and strength; man and the eagle are symbols of wisdom and omniscience; the latter attribute is also expressed in the later form of the symbol by the multitude of eyes. The continual mobility of the ζῶα, Rev. iv. 8, signifies the never-resting quickness of the divine operations; this is probably symbolized also by the wheels which are given to the cherubim in Ezek. i., in which, as is there said, "the Spirit of the Living One" is. The number *four*, connected with the cherubim in the later form of the symbol, is the signature of all-sidedness (toward the four quarters of heaven). Thus Jehovah, when He is honored as He who is *enthroned above the cherubim*, is acknowledged as the *God who rules the world on all sides in power, wisdom, and omniscience.* Instead of natural powers working unconsciously, is placed the all-embracing, conscious activity of the Living God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, and hereby the whole view of nature in the Old Testament is defined; comp., for example, the view of the thunderstorm in Ps. xviii. 11. By this exposition of the cherubim we are to determine the meaning of the invocation in Ps. lxxx. 1: "Thou Shepherd of Israel, who art enthroned upon the cherubim, shine forth!"

The philological explanation of the term is altogether uncertain. The Rabbinical interpretation, which Hengstenberg has accepted, and which regards the word as made up from the כְּ of comparison and רֹב, and gives it the meaning "equal to many," "like a multitude," *i.e.* the union of plurality, assumes a far too monstrous etymological formation. The view of Umbreit and others, who hold that כְּרוּב is formed by a transposition from רְכוּב, and denotes the divine chariot, is more plausible; and in fact the cherubim are called מֶרְכָּבָה in 1 Chron. xxviii. 18; comp. again Ps. xviii.11. If we derive the word from כרב, various explanations are possible, on account of the ambiguity of the stem. In Syriac, the stem means, to carve; hence some explain כְּרוּב by γλυπτόν, carved work = imagery, from which Keil gets the word to mean "figments of the imagination," and Hävernick (*Alttest. Theologie*, ed. 2, p. 95), creatures of the ideal world. In Arabic, the stem *karaba* means to lace, and then to straighten, to distress; so others give the word the meaning—alarming, horrible creatures. Others, again, have got at the signification *nobilis princeps*, by the combination of כרב and כרם. Still others give to the stem כרב the meaning ἁρπάζειν, to snatch, so that the cherubim would be designated by their sweeping power, which makes them, so to speak, a sort of harpies. Frequently the word כְּרוּב has been compared with the Greek γρύψ, the griffin, that fabulous animal of the East which watched over hidden

treasures; and for this view special reference is made to Ezek. xxviii. 14 ff., where the king of Tyre, who walked in Eden on the mount of God between stones of fire, and covered and protected them with his outspread wings, is compared to a cherub. The sense of the passage, however, is clear from what we have already learned. The king of Tyre, who deifies himself, is called a cherub because he looks on himself as the guardian of the divine dwelling-place, in whom is reflected the majesty of God.

(1) Literature: Riehm, *De natura et ratione symbolica Cheruborum* (Programm), 1864; Hengstenberg, *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 161 ff.; as also his essay in answer to Riehm, in the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1866 (May and June), reprinted in his *Commentary on Ezekiel* at the end of the first part, p. 499 ff., in which is defended the earlier conception of Bähr, Hengstenberg, and others. [Riehm's view is restated, with modifications and additions, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1871. See also his articles "Bundeslade" and "Cherubim" in his *Handwörterbuch*. For the argument in favor of the purely Semitic origin of the word and its Assyrian meaning, see Lenormant, *Beginnings of History*, transl. from the French, with an Introduction, by Prof. Francis Brown, N. Y., 1883, pp. 116–145.—D.]

(2) Hengstenberg says: "Thus we see that originally they did not belong to the sphere of revelation, but to the sphere of natural religion" (*Comment. on Ezek.* i. p. 254).

(3) Hengstenberg finds that this symbol occurs no less than eighty-five times in the Old Testament (*l.c.* p. 499).

(4) Riehm: just on this account it was not found necessary to describe them more in detail.

(5) Comp. Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.* p. 572 ff.

II. THE ACTIONS OF THE MOSAIC WORSHIP (1).

§ 120.

Introductory Remarks: 1. *On the Idea of Offerings in General.*

The actions of worship fall under the general notion of *offerings*. *The essential nature of an offering in general is the devotion of man to God expressed in an outward act.* Man feels impelled to express in actions which he directs exclusively to God partly his dependence on God in general (in virtue of which he knows that he is dependent on God in his being and his possessions, in his active and passive life), and partly the special relations in which he is placed toward God. True, the inward impulse which impels man to praise, thank, and supplicate God finds expression in words of devotion; but this impulse is not fully satisfied till this word is, as it were, *embodied* in a corresponding action, in which man *deprives and denies himself of something*, and thus by deeds testifies the earnestness of his devotion to God. Under the idea of offering, in the *widest sense* of the word, are also to be reckoned the observances of sacred abstinence; to which belong, in the Mosaic system, fasting, the Nazarite vow, and the Levitical acts of purification,—forms of observances which in heathen religions sometimes rise to the most hideous self-torture and self-mutilation. In the *narrower sense*, however, the idea of offering (corresponding to its derivation from *offerre*) refers to positive acts, which consist in the *presentation of a gift*. In this sense it is designated in the Old Testament

by the terms מִנְחָה (in the more general signification in which the word stands in Gen. iv. 3 ff., but never in the sacrificial laws), מַתְּנוֹת קֹדֶשׁ (Ex. xxviii. 38), but generally by קָרְבָּן, that is, presentation (Mark vii. 11 : Κορβᾶν ὁ ἐστι δῶρον). The offering may be made in such a way that the object presented remains intact, but henceforth is placed exclusively at the disposition of the Divinity (to this head belong the gifts of dedication,—for which in Num. vii. 3 ff., xxxi. 50, the word קָרְבָּן is likewise used,—those persons who were dedicated to the service of the sanctuary, etc.), or in such a way that what is offered is at once used up in honor of the Divinity in some manner. In the latter case, the act of devotion is generally completed in the consumption of the gift, or at least a part of it, by the fire on the altar (מִזְבֵּחַ). This is what is meant by offering in the *most limited sense*, of which in the Old Testament the designation is אִשֶּׁה, *i.e.* "firing" [E. V. an offering made by fire], a term used in speaking of all offerings which were brought to the altar, whether they were wholly or partially burnt (comp. Lev. i. 9, 17, ii. 3, iii. 3, 9, iv. 35, v. 12, etc.) (2).—An essential factor in the offering is *substitution*, which can take place in a twofold way,—first, when the person who brings the offering is represented by the gift substituted in his room ; and secondly, when something is substituted for the object to be offered. The latter case generally occurs in the shape of the representation of a whole class of things by a part of the class which is selected to be offered (as in the case of the first-born and of the firstlings of the harvest), but sometimes as strict substitution, so that what fell to be offered, but from some cause or other was not fit to be offered, was replaced by an object of a connected kind (comp. Ex. xiii. 13, xxxiv. 20), or some other surrogate (3). The idea of substitution is *brought out most fully* when another life is offered in the place of the life of the person who offers ; but the idea of substitution reaches much further than this, inasmuch as there is self-renunciation in every real sacrifice,—the offerer putting, so to speak, a part of himself into his gift, whether impelled by love and thankfulness, or by fear of the vengeance of God, to which he knows himself or something he possesses to be exposed. With this it agrees that no real offering can be made of another man's possession (compare 2 Sam. xxiv. 24), but only of what is already one's property, or could at least (as in the case of booty) be held as such, and that in the willingness to acknowledge God's higher right of property to one's own possession, and to give up to Him even what is dearest, it is that the genuine spirit of sacrifice is proved, as is expressed in the story in Gen. xxii.

(1) Literature : Outram, *De sacrificiis libri duo*, 1678 [*Two dissertations on Sacrifices*, transl. by John Allen, 1817] ; Saubert, *de sacrificiis veterum*, 1699 ; Sykes, [Essay on Sacrifices, 1748] *Versuch über die Natur, Absicht und den Ursprung der Opfer*, with notes and additions by Semler, 1778. In more modern times compare Scholl, on the sacrificial ideas of the ancients, especially the Jews, in the *Studien der evang. Geistlichkeit Württembergs*, i., iv., and v. ; Bähr, *Symbolik des mos. Kultus*, ii. ; Thalhofer, *Die unblutigen Opfer des mos. Kultus*, 1848 ; Hengstenberg, "das Opfer," in the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1852, Nos. 12–16 ; Neumann, "die Opfer des A. Bundes," in the *Deutschen Zeitschr. für christl. Wissenschaft und christl. Leben*, 1852, Nos. 30–33 ; 1853, Nos. 40–44 ; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, ed. 2, p. 214 ff. ; Keil, "Die Opfer des A. Bundes," in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1856 f. ; Delitzsch, *Commentary on Hebrews ;* my article, "Opferkultus des A. T.," in Herzog's *R.E.* x. p. 614 ff. ; Kurtz, *The Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*, 1863 ; Klie-

foth, "Ueber den alttest. Kultus," in the 4th volume of his *Liturg. Abhandlung.*; Wangemann, *Das Opfer nach Lehre der h. Schrift*, 2 vols., 1866; Delitzsch, art. "Opfer," in Riehm. Other books will be referred to in the following pages.

(2) אִשֶּׁה cannot be used of what is not to be burnt. That the incense which was laid cold upon the shewbread is so called (Lev. xxiv. 7) is explained by the fact that it was really burnt up when the shewbread was removed (see Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 10. 7).

(3) Among the Egyptians we find substitution of artificial figures of animals. Herodotus, ii. 47, says that the poor baked pigs of dough to offer. See other examples in Hermann, *Gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer der Griechen*, ed. 3, p. 146; compare also Hartung, *Religion der Römer*, i. p. 160 f.

§ 121.

Continuation: 2. *Pre-Mosaic Sacrifice and the Mosaic Covenant Sacrifice as the Basis of the Mosaic Sacrificial Worship.*

Sacrifice was not newly introduced by the Mosaic law. Genesis not only speaks of sacrifice as observed by the patriarchs, but, in Gen. iv., carries back the presenting of offerings to the earliest age of mankind (comp. § 20). As has been shown above (§ 20 f.), the pre-Mosaic offerings had the signification of *thank-offerings and offerings of supplication*, though a propitiatory element is connected with the burnt-offering (first mentioned Gen. viii. 20) lying in the רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ (literally, odor of satisfaction), through which the sacrifice has an appeasing effect, see ver. 21 (1). Offerings for atonement, in the strict sense, are not mentioned in the Old Testament before the introduction of the Mosaic sacrificial law (2). The book of Job, too, which brings before us the customs of the age of the patriarchs, represents, in chap. i. 5, xlii. 8, the presenting of burnt-offerings for sin committed, and avoids the term כִּפֶּר, which denotes *expiation* in the terminology of Mosaic sacrifice (giving, instead, the more general term קִדֵּשׁ). Besides the burnt-offering, we find in patriarchal times "sacrifice" (זֶבַח) with the sacrificial feast (comp. Iken, *dissert.* ii. 1, p. 6 ff.) first mentioned in Gen. xxxi. 54, where it serves to ratify the covenant concluded between Jacob and Laban, and so ends in a meal of peace (further, xlvi. 1, comp. Ex. x. 25, xviii. 12). Also, in xx. 24, xxiv. 5, only burnt-offerings and *shelamim* are mentioned. For an *expiatory offering*, in the strict sense, presupposes the revelation of divine holiness in the law, and the entrance of the people into covenant relation with the holy God. The transition to this point, and at the same time the *foundation of the whole system of Mosaic offerings*, is formed by the *covenant-offering* in Ex. xxiv., especially in virtue of the meaning which here for the first time (apart from the institution of the Passover) attaches to the *blood* of the sacrifice. Moses set up an altar, which represented the presence of Jehovah, and (probably round it) twelve pillars as memorials of the twelve tribes. This preparation of a *place of sacrifice* already points to the communion between Jehovah and His people now to be established, in virtue of which He wishes to have His *dwelling* in the midst of the latter. After this, Moses causes burnt-offerings and *shelamim* to be presented by young men. These young men do not, as Kurtz (3) has understood the matter, represent "the sacrificing nation in its youth as a people, which, like a young man, is pre-

pared to begin its course," for (comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, ed. 1, p. 151) it is not the people who here bring an offering for themselves; the covenant communion with God, in virtue of which the people approaches Him in the offering, is first to be established; besides, the representatives of the congregation are, vers. 1 and 9, the seventy elders. It is Moses rather,—the appointed mediator of the covenant,—who, acting in the quality of priest, here brings the covenant-offering, and the young men are merely his servants (4). Moses now takes the half of the blood of the offering, and sprinkles it on the altar; then he reads the book of the covenant to the people; and after the people have again promised fidelity to the law, he sprinkles them with the other half of the blood, saying: "Behold, the blood of the covenant which Jehovah concludes with you over these words." The halving of the blood certainly refers to the two parties of the covenant, which now are brought together in a unity of life—not, however, in the sense in which two contracting parties mix their blood in the heathenish usages cited by Knobel [but not by Dillmann] on this passage; for the blood of the offered sacrifice belongs entirely to Jehovah, and the sprinkling of the people with a part of it rather signifies an *appropriation* of the people on God's part. According to the significance which from this time forth was to attach to the blood, and which will be discussed more particularly afterward (§ 127),—a significance which the people were already prepared to understand by the manipulation of the blood at the first Passover (Ex. xii. 22),—the act of sacrifice before us is to be understood as follows:—The mediator of the covenant first offers to God in the blood a *pure life*, which comes in between God and the people, covering and atoning for the latter. In this connection the sprinkling of the altar does not merely signify God's acceptance of the blood, but at the same time serves to consecrate the place in which Jehovah enters into intercourse with his people. But when a portion of the blood accepted by God is further applied to the people by an act of sprinkling, this is meant to signify that the same life which is offered up in atonement for the people is also intended to consecrate the people themselves to covenant fellowship with God. The act of consecration thus becomes an act of renewal of life,—a translation of Israel into the kingdom of God, in which it is filled with divine vital energy, and is sanctified to be a kingdom of priests, a holy people (5). The procedure at the dedication of the priests (Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 30) is quite analogous (comp. § 95). So the blood of the covenant, like the bloody token in Ex. xii. 22, separates the chosen people from the world, and hence its significance as a pledge, Zech. ix. 11 (which passage clearly refers to Ex. xxiv.). The sacrificial feast forms the close of the whole festival, at which the elders of Israel, who, ver. 2, before the sacrifice, durst not approach Jehovah, but are now atoned for, get a view of God, and eat and drink before Him as a pledge and testimony of the way in which, in the communion of the covenant, Jehovah's nearness is to be experienced and the richness of His benefits enjoyed.—In this first Mosaic act of offering (the Passover is an offering only in the wider sense, § 154) is already expressed the character of the ordinances of worship which arise on the basis of the covenant now concluded. The covenant is to subsist on offerings,—under the condition of offerings to be presented (עֹלֹת וְזָבַח, Ps. 1. 5),—for the people are not to approach their God with empty hands (Ex. xxiii. 15; Deut. xvi. 16 f.). In order, however, to make such an approach *possible* to the sinful

people, and to secure the duration of the covenant, which is continually endangered by the guilt of the congregation, God institutes an *ordinance of atonement*, which is principally carried out in acts of worship specifically expiatory, but which also runs through the whole of the rest of the worship; in all parts of which, but especially by the use which is from this time forward made of the *blood* of the sacrifice at the burnt-and thank-offerings, the idea is expressed that man may never *approach God without previous atonement*,—that this must be accomplished before he can expect that his *gift* will be favorably received by God. On the other hand, it is not correct to call atonement the leading idea of Mosaic sacrifice, in the sense that every offering is to be classed under this idea. It is rather the case that the *gift or offering*, in the strict sense,—that which really comes upon the altar,—*follows* on the completion of the atoning act. (The right understanding of sacrifice depends essentially on the distinction between these two elements.)

In speaking now of the ritual of Mosaic offerings, we begin with offerings in the narrower sense, which are laid upon the altar, and so immediately given over to Jehovah. As we treat of these, we shall bring in also, in their proper places, the remaining kinds of korban [gift] which were offered to Jehovah only indirectly —that is, by payment to the priests or Levites respectively (the first-born and tithes, also the shewbread, comp. § 117, may be reckoned with these) (6).

(1) The second offering mentioned in the Old Testament (Gen. viii. 20) is that which was offered by Noah after the Flood, taken from all clean cattle and all clean birds—that is, from those animals which were appointed for the food of man. It was offered as a burnt-sacrifice on an altar, from which the odor ascended to the God enthroned in heaven, and pleased Him (ver. 21). The motive of this offering is mainly thanksgiving for the deliverance experienced. Of expiation for offences committed there is no mention, since in fact, the judgment at which Noah was regarded as righteous before God, has been executed. And yet, as is shown by ver. 21, there is even here something more than a thank-offering. Man draws near to God in the offering, seeking at the same time grace for the future, after having seen the severity of God's penal justice (comp. the explanation of the passage by Josephus, *Ant.* i. 3. 7). And God graciously accepts this; He is willing, in answer to such a request for grace, to spare man, who would always draw down new judgments of extermination on himself by his sinfulness. Thus far it is correct to say, that here we have a first elementary and symbolic expression of the necessity of an atonement before God (O. v. Gerlach on this passage).—From the passages Gen. iv. and viii. 20, there can be no doubt what answer the Old Testament gives to the long-disputed question, which is mainly connected with the first of these passages,—namely, whether the origin of sacrifice is to be traced back to *a positive divine command*, or to human *invention* and caprice (comp. on this controversy in particular, Deyling, "de sacrificiis Habelis atque Caini," in the *Observ. sacræ*, ed. 3, ii. p. 53 ff.; Carpzov, *App. ant.* p. 699 ff.; Outram, *De sacrificiis*, i. 1, where the various views are compared in detail). In this way of putting the question, the alternative is not correctly formulated. For if the first view is untenable, since there is no *trace of a divine command* to present offerings in the context of either passage, but, on the contrary, the whole character of the two narratives points to a deed which has no value apart from its spontaneousness (comp. Nägelsbach, *Der Gottmensch*, i. p. 335 ff., where also the arguments of Deyling are examined), yet, on the other side, both passages represent this free act as one thoroughly *agreeable to the divine will*; and there is in them no trace of a mere divine condescension, from which, as is well known, Spencer (*De leg. hebr. rit.* iii. diss. ii.) sought to explain the Old

Testament sacrifices. Man is not first impelled to make offerings by the *rudeness of his nature*, to which God *must make some indulgence lest something worse come instead* (comp. Spencer, in Pfaff's ed. p. 754); he does not offer sacrifice by force of his natural *badness*, as we should be obliged to say on the deistic conception of sacrifice, which does, indeed, in a manner, give a correct explanation of what sacrifice degenerated into;* but man offers in *virtue of his inalienable divine image*, which makes it *impossible for him to abstain* from seeking that communion with God for which he was created, by such active self-devotion as takes place in offerings. Offerings are thus, as Neumann (in the above-cited essay, *Deutsche Zeitschr. für christl. Wissensch.* 1852, p. 328) well says, "free expressions of the divinely constituted nature of man," so that they are no more arbitrary inventions than prayer is, but spring in the same way as prayer from an inward necessity, to which man freely yields. The passages in Genesis which treat of the sacrificial places of the patriarchs (xii. 8, xiii. 4, xxvi. 25, xxxiii. 20) also point to the close connection between the service of sacrifice and prayer, or invocation of God. [That these altars were only places of devotion, and not of sacrifice, as Delitzsch, art. "Opfer" in Riehm, p. 1115, observes, is, I think, not probable].—On the act described in Gen. xv., comp. § 80; on the history in Gen. xxii., comp. § 23, with note 9. The latter narrative is important for the development of the Old Testament idea of offering. In it is expressed, in the first place, the *divine sanction of sacrifice in general* as the proof of man's believing devotion to God; and in the second place, the declaration that such devotion is to be proved by readiness to part with even the dearest possession out of obedience to God; while, thirdly, human sacrifice is *banished* out of the region of the religion of revelation; and fourthly, the acceptance of an animal victim as the substitute of man is ordained. In the whole story there is no mention of an atonement for the obtaining of which Isaac was to die; and therefore the offering of the ram cannot have the meaning of a propitiatory sacrifice of a vicarious kind.

(2) Compare what Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* ed. 2, p. 352, remarks on sacrifice in the Homeric times. "Man's willingness to honor the god with such enjoyment (the vapor of the fat) is what makes the offering pleasant to the latter; and there is no difference in this respect between an offering of atonement and any other offering. That atonement in general depends only on the paying of honor to the Deity, on the acknowledgment of his might and the expression in act of man's feeling of dependence, is plain from the fact that other services are also sufficient to conciliate the deity." [Above art.]

(3) See Kurtz, *History of the Old Covenant*, ii. p. 143; also his *Alttest. Opferkultus*, p. 278.

(4) The indefinite mention of the young men, and the fact that nothing is said of their being twelve in number, or the like, is in favor of this view.

(5) Comp. Keil, *Bibl. Archäol.* i. p. 260.

(6) In describing the regulations concerning offerings, we treat, 1. of the *material* of the offering and the classification of offerings which is given from this point of view; 2. of the actions of which offerings are made up, or the *ritual of offering*; 3. of the genera and species into which the offerings fall according to their *design*.

* According to Blount, wicked men offer because they who do not like to do favors to one another for nothing judge the Divinity in the same way; according to Tindal, they sacrifice because they imagine that the cruel God delights in the slaughter of innocent creatures,—a delusion which was then made use of by the selfish corporation of priests in order to introduce the ritual ordinances established by themselves. See Lechler, *Geschichte des englischen Deismus*, pp. 119, 338. On Shuckford's argument on the other side, see § 12, note 6.

1. THE MATERIAL OF THE OFFERINGS.

§ 122.

Bloody and Bloodless Offerings.

According to their material, offerings are partly bloody and partly bloodless. *Bloody* offerings are exclusively *animal offerings*. Human sacrifice (which the insane criticism of Ghillany, *Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer*, 1842, and of other writers represents as even an essential part of the Mosaic worship) was excluded from the legitimate worship of God. This follows, as we have already seen, from Gen. xxii. 11, and then from what is commanded in Ex. xiii. 13, xxxiv. 20, as to the redemption of the first-born of mankind (cf. § 105). To offer children as they were offered to Moloch (Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2 ff.), and as was generally the custom among the Semitic nations (1), is called an abomination, Deut. xii. 31. Man has by the law no other power over human life than that of the execution of judgment (comp. §§ 99 and 108). Even the חֵרֶם, the exterminating curse or ban (§ 134), is intended to serve to glorify God's punitive justice. It may be classed in a sense under the head of offerings in a wider sense, as in Lev. xxvii. 28 it stands among things sacredly (comp. also Isa. xxxiv. 5 f., Jer. xlvi. 10, where even the word זֶבַח is used for it). But the *herem*, by which a thing or person is *swept away* from before Jehovah (comp. *e.g.* 1 Sam. xv. 33), stands in direct antithesis to offerings in the narrower sense, to the gift offered on the altar. Thus, too, that act of revenge by the Gibeonites allowed by David, 2 Sam. xxi. 9, in which a bloody revenge, exceeding that demanded by the law, was executed, is not to be regarded as properly a human sacrifice. It is, however, clear from Ezek. xx. 26, that the sacrifices of children which occurred in [idolatrous] Israel were connected with a wrong application of the law of primogeniture (Ex. xiii. 2, 11 f., xxii. 28) (2).

There is no name in the sacrificial law of the Pentateuch which designates generally the *bloody* offering; Lev. i. 2 uses the circumlocution קָרְבָּן מִן־הַבְּהֵמָה. The word זֶבַח, to which in later usage the more general meaning (as designating animal sacrifice generally) cannot be denied, is used in the Pentateuch only of Shelamim. For a *dry vegetable offering*, the technical term is מִנְחָה (A. V., meat-offering; better, food-offering); and the *drink*-offering which was added to the Minhha, and which consisted of wine, is called נֶסֶךְ.—Offerings of animals are most important, chiefly on account of the significance attaching to the blood. Food-offerings certainly appear as *independent* gifts, Lev. v. 11 (as a substitute for an animal offering); vi. 12 ff. (as a priestly offering of dedication); Num. v. 15 ff. (as the jealousy-offering). It is probable, too, that the food-offerings described in Lev. ii. could be presented by themselves as free-will gifts (3). But for the most part, the food-offerings, and the drink-offerings which went along with them, were connected with animal-offerings. Here, indeed, they form no mere supplementary gift; they are rather co-ordinate with that part of the animal which is laid as a *gift* on the altar. But since they also have as their presupposition the *atonement* completed by the manipulation of blood at the offering of an animal, they are in fact dependent on the animal-offering. This dependence is

seen also in this, that the quantity of the food and drink-offerings had to be determined according to the various kinds of animals to which they were annexed.

(1) See Lasaulx, *die Sühnopfer der Griechen und Römer*, p. 11.

(2) (Compare Umbreit on this passage.) A misunderstanding, such as might easily arise in the zeal for sacrifice depicted in Mic. vi. 7, even apart from the probability that, in the idolatrous minds of the people, the Holy One of Israel, whose zeal is a consuming fire, may often have been confounded with the fire-god Moloch. When it is said, in Ezek. xx. 25 f., that Jehovah gave them statutes that were not good, on account of their falling away, to destroy them, the offering of children is not declared to be agreeable to the law; but the passage is to be understood like others in which men are said to be *given over* to what is sinful as a punishment (comp. § 76).

(3) So the Jewish tradition; comp. Maimonides, *l.c.* p. 64; also Winer, *Real-Lex.* ed. 3, ii. p. 494; and Thalhofer, *l.c.* p. 51 ff.

§ 123.

The Material of Animal Offerings.

In reference to the materials of animal offerings, it is laid down as law:

1. That they must be taken from among the *clean* animals, cf. Lev. xxvii. 9, 11. In Lev. xi. and Deut. xiv. the Mosaic law distinguishes clean and unclean animals in the following way (1):—Of the larger land animals (בְּהֵמָה), all those are clean which have cloven hoofs (that is, divided quite through) and which chew the cud; those which have not these two characteristics, or have only one of them, as the camel, the hare, the pig, etc., are unclean. Of *water animals*, those are clean that have fins and scales. With respect to birds (עוֹף), no general distinctive characteristic is given; there are only twenty (in Leviticus) or twenty-one sorts (in Deuteronomy), including the bat (עֲטַלֵּף), enumerated by name as unclean, and these are for the most part birds of prey and waders, also the stork (חֲסִידָה). In the whole realm of small animals (שֶׁרֶץ), the use of grasshoppers is alone allowed among those that have wings (שֶׁרֶץ הָעוֹף); while of those that crawl and creep on the earth (הַשֶּׁרֶץ הַשֹּׁרֵץ עַל־הָאָרֶץ) none are allowed, but eight kinds are expressly forbidden (weasel, mouse, lizard, etc.).—*On what ground does this distinction rest?* The view found in the fourth book of the Maccabees, v. 25, and among some of the Rabbins, that the flesh of certain creatures is injurious to the soul of man, that is, to the understanding, is only supported by a false explanation of Lev. xi. 44 (2), and cannot possibly be applied to the case before us, even were it not certain that doctrines of this kind are quite foreign to Mosaism. With reference to some animals (as swine), it may certainly be taken as *possible* that the law is fixed by dietetic considerations; but *this principle is nowhere stated.* Nor can the distinction between clean and unclean animals be traced to a dualistic view of creation, such as prevails in the Zend religion. That the one class of animals belongs to Jehovah, and not the other, is certainly not the Mosaic view. Uncleanness of certain animals is spoken of only so far as they are thereby excluded from being used as food; but even unclean animals might be dedicated to Jehovah, only they had to be redeemed, Lev. xxvii. 11 ff. The ground of the matter lies generally in the *principle of the whole law* (§ 84), that the people of Israel should impress on every sphere of life the stamp by which it acknowledges itself to be a people sep-

arated by Jehovah and dedicated to Him. So even in their food there must be a *separation* in which this *reference to Jehovah* is expressed, comp. Lev. xx. 24–26: "I am Jehovah your God, who have separated you from other nations; ye shall therefore put a difference between clean beasts and unclean," etc. But in the definition of those animals which are separated as *unclean*, it appears that, on the one hand, the principle was laid down that *all flesh-eating animals* were necessarily to be accounted unclean, because to partake of *blood* is an abomination. So, too, the birds enumerated are partly birds of prey, and partly such as feed on worms and the like. To these are added all animals that had anything repulsive and hideous. But now, in order to arrive at a fixed rule of separation among the larger land animals, it was natural to select certain *common properties in those animals* the flesh of which had always been looked on as the most *excellent nourishment*, and by these to define the clean animals. In consequence of the principle thus derived, the camel, the hare, and also (Ex. xiii. 13, xxxiv. 20) the ass ("quia neque ruminat, neque fissam habet ungulam"), etc., were excluded; any other ground than that given in Lev. xi. 4–6 could hardly have existed here (3).

2. Of clean animals, those were *fit for offering* which formed the proper stock of *domesticated* animals,—cattle, sheep, and goats; both sexes might be offered, but for offerings of a higher character males alone were employed. Of fowl, turtle-doves and young pigeons were offered. The former are to be met with so often in Palestine as birds of passage that it was not necessary to rear them specially; they formed in particular the animal food of the poor, and this explains their use in offerings. Pigeons and turtle-doves might, with the exception of a few offerings of purification, be presented only by the poor, as a substitute for the larger animals of sacrifice (Lev. v. 7, xii. 8).—No part of the produce of the chase or of fishing was fit to be offered. The animals of sacrifice were to be *without blemish* (תְּמִים), free from bodily imperfections (כָּל־מוּם לֹא יִהְיֶה־בּוֹ); see especially Lev. xxii. 21–24, comp. also Mal. i. 13; an exception was allowed only with the נְדָבוֹת (on this hereafter, § 132, with note 3). With respect to the *age* of the animals offered, the law commanded that they should at least be eight days old (Lev. xxii. 27, comp. with Ex. xxii. 29), because in the first eight days every newborn creature was accounted unclean (comp. § 87); this is not prescribed for doves. On the other side, the animals presented were also to be in the *vigor of youth* (4). The age is more precisely defined only in a few cases: for cattle, in Lev. ix. 3, where a one-year-old עֵגֶל is demanded; more frequently in the case of small cattle, viz. ix. 3, xii. 6; comp. Num. xxviii. 3, 9, 11, where a ram of the first year (כֶּבֶשׂ or כֶּשֶׂב), Lev. xiv. 10, where a female of the first year (כַּבְשָׂה), Num. xv. 27, where a one-year-old goat (עֵז בַּת־שְׁנָתָהּ) is prescribed. The older animals among the cattle are designated פַּר and פָּרָה (on the contrary, שׁוֹר is used without respect to difference of age), the ram by אַיִל, the he-goat by עַתּוּד or שָׂעִיר (more fully, שְׂעִיר עִזִּים). The two last-named expressions are sharply distinguished (comp. Num. vii. 16 and 17, vers. 22 and 23, etc.); it is probable that שָׂעִיר signifies the older and עַתּוּד the younger he-goat. That, as the Rabbins declare, animals for sacrifice were, as a rule, not chosen more than three years old, does not rest on an express command of the law, and is inferred, perhaps, only from Gen. xv. 9; but the provision is quite reasonable, because at this age the beasts of sacrifice have attained their full growth, and are in their full strength.

(1) Comp. on the following, Sommer, *Bibl. Abhandl.* i. pp. 183–360.

(2) Lev. xi. 44: "Ye shall not defile your souls;" נֶפֶשׁ here, as so frequently, means the whole person (comp. § 70).

(3) [Comp. also on the fundamental thought which underlies the distinction between clean and unclean animals, Schultz, especially p. 341 f. Bestmann, *Gesch. d. chr. Sitte* I. p. 296, endeavors to connect the antithesis of clean and unclean with that of life and death and hence of the good and the evil. He thinks that the failure to separate what is physically and what is morally good and evil, which characterized all the ethical views of the ages before Christ, appears here. But the carrying out of the thought that what is treated as unclean refers to death or corruption, is attended with difficulty. The reference of the antithesis of clean and unclean to good and evil cannot in all cases be explained by that between life and death: other explanations may certainly be considered.]

(4) This, in the case of cattle, is especially expressed by the addition of בֶּן־בָּקָר; see Knobel on Lev. i. 5.

§ 124.

The Ingredients of the Vegetable Offerings. Salt in the Offerings.

The *ingredients of the vegetable-offering*, and particularly of the Minhha, or food-offering, were, according to the law in Lev. ii.—1. Ears roasted by fire, or grits, כַּרְמֶל (according to the Rabbinic tradition, the fresh, moist ears), ver. 14; 2. Flour, סֹלֶת, ver. 1,—to both of these olive oil and incense were added, vers. 1, 15 f.; 3. Unleavened loaves or cakes, prepared from סֹלֶת of three sorts, ver. 4 ff. Thus the food-offering was made of that which *served as the common nourishment of man*, and at the same time was *produced by human toil.* Orchard fruits, such as almonds and pomegranates, which require either no human care or only very little, are excluded; and with this reason is perhaps combined the consideration that offerings were to be no dainties, in contrast to the raisin-cakes [not, as A. V., flagons of wine] in the service of idols; comp. Hos. iii. 1. With reference to every Minhha, it is rigidly enjoined (Lev. ii. 11) that the offering may not be prepared with *leaven*, but must (compare ver. 4 f.) be offered as מַצָּה. This requisite of vegetable offerings seems to correspond to the faultlessness of animal sacrifices. Indeed, two kinds of fermentation (חָמֵץ) are forbidden,—first, with *leaven;* and secondly, with *honey* [probably in the first instance the honey of bees, but the honey of grapes, dates, and other fruits was also no doubt forbidden]. The former certainly was used in the loaves of the first-fruits (ii. 12, xxiii. 17), which represented the common nourishment of the people, and likewise in the cakes of bread accompanying thank-offerings (vii. 13); but none of these were offered on the altar—the former fell to the share of the priests; the latter were used at the sacrificial feast. The *reason* why leaven, although it was not unclean, had a profaning effect (it was forbidden also among the Greeks and Romans in sacrificial cakes, and among the latter to the *Flamen Dialis*), is probably that the process of fermentation brought about by means of leaven was looked on as akin to corruption (1). The effect of honey is similar to that of leaven, since it easily changes into acid (2). Others (3) trace the prohibition of leaven to the fact that it imparts to the bread a certain pleasantness of taste, while all seasoning which is delightful to man is to be avoided in offerings; for similar reasons, viz. as a symbol of the delights of the world, honey would be forbidden. (Others, again,

have thought they saw a symbol of arrogance and the like in leaven, because it raises the bread.)

Salt was, according to Lev. ii. 13, essential to every meat-offering (according to the LXX on Lev. xxiv. 7 for the shewbread also). It does not follow with certainty from the passage cited that salt was prescribed also as an accompaniment to animal offerings, for the closing words, "On every קָרְבָּן thou shalt offer salt," may from the context be limited to the Minhha. At any rate, however, later usage made use of salt in animal sacrifices (comp. Mark ix. 49, *πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται*) at the burnt-offering (Ezek. xliii. 24; Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 9. 1) (4); doubtless also at thank-offerings, which were combined with food-offerings. On the contrary, the use of salt at offerings of atonement has not been hitherto distinctly proved (5).—The point of view under which the use of salt with offerings is to be regarded is not mainly that it makes the offering palatable. Salt, in virtue of its power of seasoning and preventing putrefaction, is the *symbol of cleansing and purification* as well as of *durability*. The latter meaning is intended when it is said in Lev. ii. 13, "The salt of the covenant of thy God," referring to the indestructible endurance of the covenant; and therefore a covenant regulation of God, which is for ever valid, is called a covenant of salt (Num. xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5). On the other hand, Christ's words, Mark ix. 49, "Every one is salted with fire, and every offering is salted with salt," refer to the former meaning, for here the salt of the offering is paralleled with the purifying fire of self-denial and trials necessary to every man (6). ["Every believer should be seasoned, made acceptable to God, with the fires of trial and evil, and every sacrifice, *i.e.* every one who consecrates himself, shall be salted with the salt of wisdom from above." Robinson, *N. T. Lex.*—D.]

(1) Comp. Plutarch, *Quæst. Rom.* 109.—Leaven is therefore the symbol of what is impure, of what corrupts morally (Luke xii. 1; 1 Cor. v. 6–8).

(2) Pliny notes this, *Hist. nat.* xi. 15 (45). In Rabbinic usage, חִרְבִּישׁ has on this account the meaning *fermentescere*, and then *corrumpi*.

(3) So Baur, in the *Tübinger Zeitschr.* 1832, p. 68 f.; and Neumann, in the *Deutsche Zeitschr. für christl. Wissenschaft*, 1853, p. 384.

(4) *Mishna Sebachim* mentions salt only at the burnt-offerings of birds, vii. 5, but remarks, § 6, that the offering still held good even if the rubbing with salt was omitted.

(5) To the supplies in kind, which in later times fell to the share of the temple, belonged especially salt (Ezra vi. 9, vii. 22), which, as is clear from Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 3. 3, was used in large quantities, and, among other purposes, to salt the skins of the beasts sacrificed. See *Mishna Middoth*, v. 2, in which passage a special chamber for salt is mentioned, which was in the front court of the temple.

(6) Nothing but *wine* was used for the *drink-offering* which went with the food-offering. (The libation of water (1 Sam. vii. 6) is probably to be interpreted as a ceremony of purification; see O. v. Gerlach on this passage, and another view in the commentary of Thenius. On the libation of water at the feast of tabernacles, see § 156.) With reference to the wine, the law fixes nothing more than the quantity to be used. *Mishna Menachoth*, viii. 6, 7, on the contrary, contains exact rules about the kinds to be chosen, about what is to be observed with regard to the cultivation of the vineyard concerned, and about the age and preservation of the wine.

§ 125.

The Principle on which the Material of Offerings was fixed.

What is now the principle which lies at the root of these rules as to the material of offerings? The following are the *principal views*:—

1. A first view holds that these rules were fixed with an eye to *the people's property*. Thus Bähr (*Symbolik*, 1st ed. ii. p. 317): "The entire circle of all that was offered in Israel was to be the entire circle of that which is Israel's own—Israel's means of support." In fact (as was shown in § 120), if self-denial is an essential feature in offerings, a real offering can be presented only from *one's own property*; to offer another's property, as Bähr rightly notes, is a *contradictio in adjecto* (as in the case of St. Crispin). It is no argument against this that, for example, the people, in their needy circumstances after the exile, brought offerings from the largess which the Persian king bestowed on them (Ezra vi. 9, comp. vii. 17, 22, etc.). From the ordinances of Nehemiah (Neh. x. 33 ff.) it is nevertheless clear that the people were well aware that it was their duty themselves to provide what the ritual demanded. *Still*, the notion of the people's property is *far too extensive* to explain the material of offerings; and even Bähr limits the point of view of property by calling attention to the reference of the two main constituents of the offerings to the two material bases of the Hebrew state,—cattle-breeding and agriculture,—a reference, the meaning of which will appear below.

2. According to a second view, the determining principle is that of *nourishment*. Offerings are frequently called the *bread* of God; and this name is applied to offerings in general (Lev. xxi. 6, 8, 17; Num. xxviii. 2, 24; comp. Ezek. xliv. 7; Mal. i. 7), to the burnt-offering and thank-offering together (Lev. xxii. 25), to the thank-offering alone (Lev. iii. 11, 16), but the expression is never used of sin-offerings in particular. According to the Mosaic idea of God, it is not possible to understand this phrase of food offered for God's nourishment (comp. § 112, with note 2), but only of a giving to God of the people's nourishment (1). Even this point of view, however, taken generally, goes too far, because not all the clean animals which are allowed for food, and not nearly all that is eaten of the vegetable kingdom, can be made use of as material for offering. The material of offerings is, as already remarked, taken *only* from those clean animals which have been got by *rearing and cultivation*, and which form the ordinary stock of cattle, and from such produce of manual labor in field and vineyard as serves for the *common nourishment* of man. From this it is clear that the offerings are chosen with regard to the ordinary nourishment earned by the people in their calling (2). The people bring an offering to God of the food which they have produced in the vocation ordained for them by God; and thus they sanctify their calling (3), and bring a testimony of the blessing which God has given on the labor of their hands, Deut. xvi. 17.

3. On this conception, now, in the third place, that point of view gets its due which Kurtz has asserted with good reason, and which only must not, as Kurtz formerly did (*Das mosaische Opfer*, 1842, p. 60), be taken as the actual principle of choice, viz. the *psychico-biotic relation* in which the offerer stands to the gift

presented. The *feature of self-denial* essential to a real offering is particularly prominent in those gifts which are taken from what is produced by man's regular daily toil, and at the same time from the *best and most precious part* of such produce; and it is quite specially an act of self-denial to give the first-fruits of the herd and of the field, to which the heart is wont to cling particularly. But what Philo points out (*de vict.* § 1) has also a place in these considerations, viz. that those animals are dedicated as sacrifices which are the most tame, the best accustomed to man's hand, or, if you will, the most innocent—which surrender themselves most patiently to slaughter. Consider the passage concerning the patient sacrificial lamb in Isa. liii. 7.

After the foregoing remarks, the provisions respecting the material of offerings, in reference to what they include and exclude, require no further explanation. There is but one more question, viz.: What is the meaning to be attached to the *oil* and the *incense* which accompany the food-offering? As to the latter, there is no doubt that, as the offering of incense is not merely to serve to produce a sweet odor, but is the symbol of prayer ascending to God, and well-pleasing in His sight (comp. Ps. cxli. 2) (4), so too the incense along with the Minhha is to serve to imprint more definitely on the offering the character of a *vehicle of prayer*. It is disputed, however, whether the oil, like the incense and the salt, is simply a *supplement* to the Minhha (thus Kurtz in particular),—namely, an unction indicating (because oil in the Old Testament appears as the symbol of the communication of the Spirit) that only such labor is well-pleasing to God as is consecrated by the Divine Spirit, that only those gifts should be brought to Him which are produced by such toil,—or whether (so Bähr) the oil in the offering is co-ordinate with the grain and the wine, and thus is not a mere accompaniment, but an *independent constituent* of the gift—as indeed oil is frequently specified in the Old Testament, along with corn and wine, among the chief productions of Palestine (5). The co-ordination of the oil and the incense in Lev. ii. 1, 15, as well as the circumstance that the oil, with the incense, was omitted in the food-offering for sin and jealousy (Lev. v. 11 and Num. v. 15), seem to favor Kurtz's view. On the other hand, the law in Num. xv., where the provisions as to the quantity of oil to be used are quite co-ordinate with the quantities of wine in the drink-offering, favors the second view. The omission of the oil, which makes food savory, in the offerings of sin and jealousy is also explicable on the second view: these offerings were to be of a gloomy character, and therefore in them the libation of wine was also omitted; and in the offering of jealousy a less valuable kind of flour was used (6).

(1) [Several modern writers, *e. g.* Dillmann (in his *Commentar*, p. 376), H. Schultz (p. 417), F. W. Schultz (in Zöckler's *Handbuch*, i. p. 252) explain the phrase "bread of God" by the low view concerning God in the earlier time, according to which food was offered to God for him to partake of, a view which gave way at a later period to more spiritual conceptions. Köhler (i. p. 394) finds in the expression the thought that the offering is enjoyed by Jehovah and refreshing to Him, as showing the disposition of the offerer as expressed by his offering; and F. W. Schultz holds that this meaning was subsequently attached to the words.]

(2) Because Israel is not to be a people of hunters, no offering of game is commanded.

(3) Compare Keil, *Handb. der bibl. Archäologie*, i. p. 198 ff.

(4) Ps. cxli. 2: "Let my prayer come before Thee as incense; and the lifting up of my hands as the evening Minhha."

(5) See Kurtz, *Das mos. Opfer*, p. 101, and *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*, p. 287 f.; Bähr, *l.c.* pp. 302, 316.

(6) On the contrary, the parallel drawn by Bähr between the oil of the food-offering and the fat of animal sacrifices has been rejected by Kurtz with good reason (*Das mos. Opfer*, p. 94).

2. THE RITUAL OF SACRIFICE.

§ 126.

The Ritual of Animal Sacrifice: Presentation at the Altar; Laying on of Hands; Slaughter.

The parts that make up the *action of offering*, and first of *animal* sacrifice, are in general—1. The presentation of the animal to be sacrificed before the altar; 2. The laying on of hands; 3. Killing; 4. Sprinkling of the blood; 5. Burning on the altar (1).

1. The *consecration* of the offerer, accomplished by avoiding all levitical defilement, and by washing, preceded the sacrificial festival (see 1 Sam. xvi. 5, comp. Philo, *de vict. off.* § 1). On this the offerer had in person to bring the animal selected to the entrance of the tabernacle, Lev. i. 3, iv. 4, where stood the altar of burnt sacrifice (Ex. xl. 6). The term for this is, in Lev. iv. 4 and other passages, הֵבִיא, distinguished from הִקְרִיב, which designates the proper presentation of offerings on the altar, i. 3; comp. especially xvii. 4 f., 9 (2).

2. Then the offerer (if there was more than one, comp. e.g. Ex. xxix. 10, one after the other) laid, or more correctly pressed firmly, his hand on the head of the sacrificial animal (Lev. i. 4, iii. 2, iv. 4, etc.) (3). The term סָמַךְ יָדוֹ here used properly means to prop or lean the hand; according to the Rabbins, the hands were to be laid on with the whole bodily strength (בְּכֹל כֹּחַ, Maimonides). Doubtless the utterance of some declaration as to the destination of the offering presented (petition, confession, thanks, etc.) was connected with the laying on of hands, or *Semikha* (4). The *signification of the laying on of hands* is not merely (as has often been said, see Knobel on Lev. i. 4) to express in general that thereby the beast to be sacrificed is removed from the power and possession of him who makes the offering, and devoted to God; but (comp. Hofmann in his *Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 246) the laying on of hands, occurring also at the dedication of the Levites, Num. viii. 10 (comp. § 94), is, as is expressed by letting the hand down on the head, the *dedication* of that which the acting person awards to the other in virtue of the fulness of power that he possesses over it. The offerer, by the laying on of his hands, *appoints* the animal to be for him a medium and vehicle of atonement, thanks, or supplication, according to the designation of the offering with which at the time he now wishes to appear before God. The laying on of hands must not be limited to the imputation of sin (as is frequently done) (5).

3. The *slaughtering* of the beast of sacrifice (שָׁחַט, the term "to kill," is never used) follows immediately on the laying on of hands, and, as the law presupposes throughout, is executed at *private offerings by the offerer himself*. True, it

lay in the nature of the case that at this act the assistance of another had to be called in; but the slaughtering of private offerings was in no case a specific business of the priests, as has often been assumed (so by Philo, *de vict.* § 5). (The reason of the exception in offerings of doves will be mentioned below). But at those sacrifices which formed the standing service at the offerings for the cleansing of lepers (Lev. xiv. 13, 25), as well as at the sacrifices offered for the whole nation (comp. 2 Chron. xxix. 22, 24), the slaughtering was the business of the priests, who were probably assisted by the Levites (comp. ver. 34) (6).

For burnt sacrifices, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, the *place* of slaughtering was on the north side of the altar (Lev. i. 11, iv. 24, 29, 33, vi. 18, xiv. 13). A thank-offering might, it appears, be slaughtered at other places in the court. Ewald (*Antiquities*, p. 44) would see in the choice of the north side a remnant of the ancient belief that the Divinity dwelt either in the east or the north, and came from thence; but that the slaughtering of the sacrifice has also the meaning of a presentation before God has yet to be proved. We might rather say, with Tholuck (*Das Alte Testament im Neuen*, ed. 3, p. 91), that the north side is chosen for slaughtering the offering because it is dark, and therefore cheerless. The law makes no regulations for the *manner* of slaughtering; tradition, however, is all the more explicit on this account, and makes it aim mainly at the speediest and most complete way of obtaining the blood. On this principle, too (as Bähr, *l.c.* p. 343, has rightly discerned), we are to explain the manner of procedure prescribed for the offering of pigeons, Lev. i. 15—namely, that the priest himself must wring off the head of the bird, in order to be able to press out the blood on the spot.—In the Mosaic ritual, the slaughtering of the offering has apparently no independent significance; it only serves as a means of obtaining the blood. It is at least not indicated in the law of offering that what the offerer deserved as a sinner is executed on the animal slaughtered, and that thus the death of the sacrifice satisfies the divine punitive justice. Though much that is beautiful can be said on the connection of the idea of a *pœna vicaria* with the offering (the later Jewish theology lays great emphasis on this idea), nothing can be adduced in favor of it from the sacrificial laws. Certainly the act of slaughter, if it was to represent the punishment of death deserved by the offerer—if the shedding of the blood under the sacrificial knife was an act of real expiation, must have been more *prominently set forth*, and the act of slaughter must unquestionably have been assigned not to the offerer of the sacrifice, but to the priest, as the representative of the punishing God. Or shall God appear as a judge, who commands the transgressor to execute himself with the sword? (7). Besides, if the slaughter was really an act of atonement, it would probably have taken place on the altar itself, and not by the side of it. The act of atonement at the offering, with which the specific priestly functions begin, commences not with the shedding of blood, but with the use of the shed blood.

(1) The ceremonies which are peculiar to particular kinds of offerings are most suitably spoken of in the discussion of these.

(2) At this presentation, doubtless, the priest examined whether the condition of the animal corresponded to the sacrificial regulations. [Against the view that the leading up of the animal was the first act of the sacrificial service, Köhler (i. p. 390) urges the fact that the fitness of the animal was not decided upon until

after this presentation. He regards the presentation as only preparatory, and not a constituent part of the act of sacrifice.]

(3) According to *Mishna Menachoth* ix. 8, both hands, for which the Rabbins refer to Lev. xvi. 21.

(4) The formulæ handed down by the Rabbins (comp. Outram, *De sacrificiis*, p. 156 ff.) are nevertheless, without doubt, of a later origin. Jewish tradition says (see Outram, p. 152) that the laying on of hands took place at all private offerings, with the exception of the first-fruits, the tithes, and the paschal lamb, but it is declared to be unnecessary at the sacrifice of birds. When the law in Lev. vii. omits to mention the laying on of hands at trespass-offerings, this is probably only because the description is curtailed, ver. 7 referring back to the sin-offering. Of the sacrifices offered for the congregation, the laying on of hands is mentioned only at the sin-offering, iv. 15, according to which it was to be performed by the elders; and in xvi. 21, with which comp. 2 Chron. xxix. 23. Tradition (comp. *Menachoth* ix. 7) says that the practice was actually limited to these cases. The provision of the law, according to which the person who offered, and not the priest, except when the offerer was the priest, had to undertake the act of laying on of hands, is, with right, emphatically urged by Jewish tradition. No one could cause his servant, or his wife, or any one else, to take his place here; only, when a dead person had vowed to give an offering, the heir was allowed to be his substitute (Outram, *l.c.* p. 143). Women, children, blind, deaf, and insane persons are designated in *Menachoth* ix. 8 as incapacitated for performing this function.—These traditional provisions show that it was a point in this laying on of the hand that the act be performed with full consciousness of its meaning.

(5) When Ewald, *Antiquities of the People of Israel*, p. 44, represents the laying on of hands, this dedicatory sign "of highest power and exertion," at the offering, as characterizing the sacred moment when the offerer, "on the point of beginning the sacred act, laid all the feelings which must now rush on him in full fervor on the head of the creature, the blood of which was presently to flow for him, and as it were to appear before God for him," he has certainly caught the right meaning of the ancient ceremony.

(6) On this point see especially Lund, *Jüdische Heiligthümer*, p. 579 f.

(7) Comp. Keil's pertinent remarks, *Luth. Zeitschr.* 1857, p. 57. [That the slaughtering has not the meaning of punishment is now almost universally admitted. Of subordinate importance is the distinction made *e.g.* by Riehm (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1877, p. 64), that the slaughtering was not only the means of obtaining the blood, but that the offerer thereby entirely renounced all right of property in the animal, and that it could never more pass into the possession of man, but was only to be used as an offering to Jehovah. Comp. also Köhler, i. p. 394.]

§ 127.

Continuation: The Use made of the Shed Blood.

4. The streaming blood of the slaughtered animal was immediately caught by a priest (1) in a basin, and—see Sheringham on *Mishna Joma*, iv. 3—was stirred incessantly to prevent it from clotting (2). The manipulation of the blood which followed *differed* according to the various kinds of offerings, that is, according to the degree in which the element of *atonement* was connected with the sacrifice. The lowest grade, in the case of burnt-offerings, trespass-offerings, and thank-offerings (Lev. i. 5, vii. 2, iii. 13, etc.), consisted in sprinkling, or rather swinging, the blood round the altar (יָצַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב) (while, at least according to Philo, *de vict.* § 5, the priest walked round it). The term זָרַק, used for this operation, is different from הִזָּה; the latter was done with the finger; the זְרִיקָה, on the con-

trary, was done directly out of the basin. The law seems to demand that at the וְזָרַק the whole supply of blood be used (3).—On the contrary, at the sin-offerings *higher* grades of manipulation of the blood took place, consisting in bringing the blood to specially sanctified places, according to the dignity of the sin-offering. In the *first* [or lower] grade of sin-offering, part of the blood was put on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering (נָתַן, Lev. iv. 30, 34); in the *second*, the blood was brought into the holy place, and part of it was sprinkled or spurted (הִזָּה, iv. 6, 17) seven times toward the inner curtain, and put on the horns of the altar of incense. In both cases the remaining quantity of blood was to be poured out (שָׁפַךְ) at the foot of the altar of burnt-offerings. In the *highest* grade of sin-offering, the blood was brought into the holy of holies, and the kapporeth [mercy-seat] was sprinkled with it.—The meaning of this use of the blood is given in Lev. xvii. 11, where the prohibition to use blood is based on the following declaration :—"For the soul of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you on the altar to atone for (properly to cover) your souls (לְכַפֵּר עַל-נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם); for the blood expiates *through* the soul (בַּנֶּפֶשׁ)"—that is, by means of, in virtue of the fact that the soul is in it (4). The same sense is given if we take the other possible view of the construction, and assuming a use of *Beth essentiæ*, interpret, "in the quality of the soul;" but in that case we must read the word בְּנֶפֶשׁ (without the article). On the contrary, the explanation "the blood atones for the soul," or "is an atonement for the soul" (LXX : *ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ἐξιλάσεται*; so A. V. and Luther), is to be rejected; for, not to speak of the tautology thus introduced into the passage, the thing to be atoned for, or more literally to be covered, is always connected with כִּפֶּר by the prepositions עַל or בַּעַד, or rarely is made the object of the verb (5). This connection of the soul and the blood is in ver. 14 expressed thus : "The soul of all flesh is דָּמוֹ בְנַפְשׁוֹ," that is, "its blood in its soul,"—its blood in as far as it has the property of the נֶפֶשׁ, its animated blood. (בְּנַפְשׁוֹ is to be taken as in Gen. ix. 4.) Knobel is probably right when he says : "The addition of בְּנַפְשׁוֹ serves to define דָּם more distinctly, in order that we may not hold the matter of the blood in itself to be the life, *e.g.* not clotted and dried blood, from which the נֶפֶשׁ has disappeared." For the manipulation of the blood must not be understood as the employment of what *once was* the life of the animal to sprinkle the holy places,—a view by which an altogether foreign idea would be introduced into the passage. As in the Old Testament living water and living flesh (in contrast to boiled, 1 Sam. ii. 15) are spoken of, so, and even more correctly, may fresh, reeking blood, still in the act of flowing, be regarded as blood which still has life in itself and is still linked with the soul. The passage means, that in the still fresh blood of the sacrifice which is put on the altar, the soul of the animal is presented for the soul of man, to atone for, more exactly to cover, the latter. The terms כִּפֶּר [to cover], with the substantives כֹּפֶר, כִּפֻּרִים, used to express the idea of atonement, denote expiation as a *covering;* the guilt is to be covered—withdrawn, so to speak—from the gaze of Him who is reconciled by the atonement, so that the guilty one can now approach Him without danger. In explanation of this, comp. especially such passages as Ex. xxx. 12 (Num. viii. 19), but in particular (Num. xvii. 11 [A. V. xvi. 46]) (6), etc. On the same view rests the converse expression—to cover by a gift the face of

the adversary who is to be reconciled, Gen. xxxii. 21 (כִּפֶּר פָּנָיו פ׳) ; comp., in xx. 16, the corresponding expression כְּסוּת עֵינַיִם (see other cognate terms adduced by Knobel on this passage). Thus, too, a *bribe* given to a judge by an accused person is called כֹּפֶר, a covering, because (1 Sam. xii. 3) the *eyes of the judge were thereby veiled.* To the sinful people *God* appears as the covering One, Deut. xxi. 8 ; Jer. xviii. 23 ; Mic. vii. 19. In the language of sacrifice, the *priest*, as the mediator between God and the people, is in general designated as *he who covers or expiates*, Lev. v. 26 (וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן לִפְנֵי יהוה וְנִסְלַח לוֹ), x. 17, xv. 15 and 30. That by which a trespass is covered can only be something by which he against whom man has offended is *satisfied.* Thus כֹּפֶר passes over into the meaning of *λύτρον*, the payment which buys a debtor free ; thus Ex. xxi. 30 (where פִּדְיֹן נַפְשׁוֹ corresponds to it) ; Num. xxxv. 31 ; comp. also Prov. vi. 35, xiii. 8. The *λύτρον* paid must of course stand in a suitable proportion to the debt to be discharged ; still the notion of equivalency does *not necessarily* lie in כֹּפֶר. The gift by which a man covers himself must be such as to satisfy the person to whom the debt is due. כֹּפֶר is the opposite of *punishment*, but in some cases only in a relative sense. Lighter punishment may be a covering against heavier, as in the case of the money-fine, Ex. xxi. 30 ; to this Isa. xxvii. 9 also belongs, where the lighter punishment, which has a purifying effect, serves to cover or atone, in contrast with the heavy punishment of extermination (?) ; comp. also the כֹּפֶר in Job xxxiii. 24. Further, the punishment which falls on one man may benefit *another* as his כֹּפֶר, and that in various ways. The punishment of death executed on a manslayer furnishes a covering for the land which has been desecrated by bloodshed, Num. xxxv. 33 ; and the exemplary punishment executed on a guilty person covers the people who are involved in connection with this crime and suffer thereby, xxv. 13 (comp. Josh. vii. for a case in point). In a manner, Prov. xxi. 18 also belongs to this : "The wicked shall be a covering (כֹּפֶר) for the righteous, and the transgressor comes in the place of the upright ;" by the divine judgment falling on the wicked man, that is (comp. xi. 8), by God's judgment being spent on the wicked man, the righteous man is freed and saved. But even the thought that perhaps a righteous man may purchase forgiveness for the people by taking their punishment is not unknown to the Pentateuch ; see Ex. xxxii. 32, and what has already (§ 29, with note 3) been said about this passage ; only that Jehovah (ver. 33) does not accept this atonement for which Moses offers himself.

Now *in what sense* is the soul of the animal presented in the blood to serve in the sacrifice as a covering for the soul of man? Generally speaking, by man's *placing the soul of the pure, innocent sacrificial animal between himself and God*, because he is unable to approach God immediately on account of his sinfulness and impurity ; as Jacob, wishing to reconcile his greatly injured brother Esau, sends the כֹּפֶר before him. More particularly, however, the question arises, Is the way in which the beast sacrificed comes in for the guilty person to be regarded as vicarious *punishment?*—in other words, Can the soul of the animal become a substitute for the soul of sinful man, because it has first by death paid the penalty which the latter should have borne, so that here the *jus talionis*, "soul for soul," Ex. xxi. 33, comes into play?—In the ritual law of the Old Testament there is, apart from sacrifice, a ceremony in which certainly the idea of the *pœna vicaria* is

expressed—namely, the ceremony prescribed in Deut. xxi. 1–9, in the case of a manslayer remaining unknown. Evidently the punishment of death incurred by the manslayer is executed symbolically on the heifer, the neck of which is broken in a brook [A. V. rough valley]. With *reference to sacrifice*, the theory of vicarious punishment certainly is not confuted by the common objection, that the soul of the sacrificial animal, laden with the curse of the sinner, might not be laid upon the altar, upon which nothing might come but what was clean and well-pleasing to God. For to this objection we may reply, with Kurtz, that after the guilt of sin is wiped away by death, the wages of sin, a *restitutio in integrum* ensues, in virtue of which the blood, which has passed through death, is to be viewed as pure and free from guilt (9). *But if*, according to this view, the offering of the blood on the altar only signifies the *divine acceptance* of the atonement completed in the death of the sacrifice, it remains unexplained why, in the ritual of sacrifice, it is not the act of slaughter by which the guilt is carried away, but the *act of presenting the blood* on the altar that is *designated as the act of atonement* (comp. the remarks in § 126). The law, in attaching no *special meaning to the slaughtering*, certainly leaves room for speculations, like those of Bähr (*l.c.* p. 211) and others, that every gift to God presupposes the offering up of the natural life, or for the common view, which recommends itself by its easy intelligibility, that a *punishment* is symbolically executed in the slaughtering (10). But the law nowhere intimates that in sacrifice, as in the *Herem* [devotion to destruction], a judicial punishment is inflicted. The altar is nowhere presented as *a place of execution*. He who has wilfully committed trespass against the covenant God and His laws falls without mercy under divine punishment; for him, therefore, there is no more sacrifice. The Mosaic ritual is a gracious ordinance of God for the congregation, which, though it does indeed sin in its weakness, yet seeks the divine countenance. For this congregation the approach to God is made possible by the fact that God gives to it in the ritual the means of covering sin which is well-pleasing to Him, the Holy One, לְרָצוֹן (as the expression so often runs). Thus the sanctuary itself (11), for which the כֹּפֶר [atonement money], paid by the people at their numbering, is used, is, Ex. xxx. 16, a זִכָּרוֹן before Jehovah, serving as a covering for the souls of the people (לְכַפֵּר עַל-נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם). Where, then, is there room in this case for a *pœna vicaria?* So, as already shown (§ 92), the priesthood with its ordinances steps in between the people and Jehovah as a covering; though both the places of worship and the *personnel* of worship, it is true, require in turn to be themselves continually cleansed and atoned for, since it is the peculiarity of the intitutions of the Mosaic worship generally that the great number of ordinances, each *requiring to be supplemented* by the others, point to the *inadequacy of the whole*, and makes the need of a complete and true atonement to be felt (comp. § 96). But it can only be the soul which really covers and atones for the soul. Man can embody his thanks and requests in a gift; but this gift, as the gift of an impure and sinful person, is itself impure—it can please God only as the gift of one who has given himself up to Him. God has therefore ordained something *in the ritual which represents this self-surrender;* he has put the *soul of the clean* and guiltless animal, which is presented to Him in the blood of the offering, in the *place* of the impure and sinful soul of the offerer, and this pure soul, coming between the offerer and the Holy God, lets Him see at His altar a pure life, through

which the impure life of the offerer is covered (12); and in the same way this pure element serves to cover the pollutions clinging to the sanctuary, and to do away with them. This is the Old Testament type for the passage, Heb. ix. 14, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου προσήνεγκεν ἑαυτὸν ἄμωμον τῷ Θεῷ).—The blood of sacrifice has thus a quite specific meaning. It is not, with Schultz, to be looked upon merely as the most noble gift dedicated to God, but it is that which alone makes God's acceptance of all gifts possible, since in it *the self-sacrifice of the offerer is vicariously accomplished.* Because man's incapability to enter immediately into communion with God appears afresh at every offering, therefore every complete offering must be preceded by the covering of the atonement of blood, and therefore this is the *conditio sine qua non* of the presentation of a gift even in the thank-offering. Where, on the contrary, the whole act of sacrifice aims at atonement, the manipulation of blood takes place in a higher degree.

(1) Executed by another, the operation did not hold good, *Mishna Sebachim* ii. 1.

(2) There is no other mention made of mixing the blood of the sacrifice with water, as Heb. ix. 19 assumes to have been done in the covenant sacrifice; see Delitzsch on this passage.

(3) [Comp. on the meaning of the presentation of blood, and on the definition of כִּפֶּר, the excellent section in Ritschl, *Doctrine of Justification and Atonement*, and the thorough article of Riehm occasioned by Ritschl's deductions, "Der Begriff der Sühne im A.T." in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1877.]

(4) In like manner כִּפֶּר stands with the *Beth instrumenti* in Lev. vii. 7; Ex. xxix. 33; Num. v. 8; 2 Sam. xxi. 3.

(5) In בַּקֹּדֶשׁ, Lev. vi. 23, xvi. 27, בְּ is to be taken locally.

(6) According to Ex. xxx. 12, the Israelite, when the people were numbered, had to cover himself by means of a sum of money, in order that no plague might come upon him when he presented himself before the Holy God.—In Num. xvii. 11 [A. V. xvi. 46] it is the incensing which symbolizes the priestly intercession, that comes between the divine wrath (קֶצֶף) and the people, and by covering the latter arrests the progress of the plague.

(7) [The passage "When he maketh all the stones of the altar as chalk-stones that are beaten in sunder" can be cited here if this destruction of the monuments of the sin of the people is understood as a judgment upon them. On the other hand, Riehm, p. 16, controverts this application of the passage, and in general the thought that a punishment can also be a means of covering. On the explanation of Delitzsch, "When it (Israel) maketh all the stones of the altar," etc., the passage cannot be cited here.]

(8) Comp. Delitzsch, *Comm. on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 742 f.; and see § 143, 2.

(9) What Keil, *Bibl. Archäol.* i. p. 213, adduces against this argument can hardly be regarded as decisive.

(10) As [according to some] is indicated in Isa. liii., and is set forth definitely in the later Jewish ritual; comp. Outram, p. 159. See, too, Delitzsch, *l.c.* p. 738 f.

(11) [If, with Keil and others, עַל עֲבֹדַת אֹהֶל is understood of the work on the structure of the tabernacle. Dillmann does not accept this explanation.]

(12) [This view is adopted by Köhler (i. p. 395 f.) and F. W. Schultz (in Zöckler i. p. 254). Very nearly akin to it is Riehm's view (p. 66 f.), that, as a covering for the protection of his soul, which is unclean through sin, the offerer brings another soul, another life, which is holy as proceeding from the divine Spirit of life. On the other hand, according to Ritschl (p. 199 ff.), the "covering" is made to refer to the sins of men, only in the sin-offering and the trespass-offer-

ing; but in accordance with its peculiar signification it covers from God, whom on account of His exaltation and His power the creature cannot approach, not the *sinful*, but the *creaturely-weak* man. The obstacle occasioned by the difference, not moral but religio-physical, between the weak creature and the Mighty Creator, is so far removed that man can draw near to God; for, "the reason" (for the view presented in Mosaism, that the sight of God would bring death upon a man) "is the distance between the transitoriness of man and the power of God, the fact that men are flesh" (p. 203, comp. also the view of the holiness of God, p. 92). The refutation of this theory has been undertaken by Riehm in the essay referred to. All the passages cited by Ritschl in support of his view of the unapproachableness of God declare only *that*, but not *why* he is unapproachable; even Ex. xxxiii. 20 (in which Riehm, p. 79, admits Ritschl's view to be expressed). But since this passage clearly does not speak of mankind in general, but only of a particular case, it is certainly unnecessary to make it express the thought that man by his very constitution cannot see God; that in virtue of his being a creature he cannot sustain the sight of him. Now if the fact is that Ritschl's view is never expressed in Mosaism, and that it is at most only a conjecture, there is no sufficient reason for regarding the fear of destruction expressed by Isaiah (vi. 6) *on account of his sinfulness*, as resting upon a conception of later origin. It is more natural to regard this conception as grounded in Mosaism, since it corresponds with the ethical teaching of Mosaism concerning God, with which the view of Ritschl is less accordant.

The attempt of H. Schultz (p. 419, 434 f.) to maintain Ritschl's theory on the assumption of a post-Isaian origin of the legislation concerning sacrifice, is, in view of Is. vi. 5., still more difficult. A further objection is that the conception in question of the relation between God and man, belonging as it does to a lower plane, is hardly reconcilable with the developed idea of God in the prophets. If Ritschl therefore were right, we should have a further argument against the late origin of the legislation against sacrifice. It must be added that the ethical point of view reappears nevertheless in Schultz when he says (p. 434) that man as flesh, in comparison with the holy God, is as a creature weak, and *on that account* morally impure, and therefore never, as he is by nature, possessed of the right consecration for drawing nigh to Israel's King. But it would be hard to prove that two such heterogeneous ideas as creaturely weakness and moral impurity "coincide in the Hebrew view," except on the supposition of a middle factor in the Old Testament view of sin; but this gives us again the ethical basis of the "covering."]

We cannot reasonably say that on the view presented in the text the divine punitive justice is made void. On the contrary, that justice is honoured when he who makes the offering declares that he is in need of a covering before the Holy God, and thereby acknowledges himself as one who, though sinning in weakness, is exposed to the divine judgment.

§ 128.

Continuation: The Burning of the Offering.

5. When the manipulation of the blood was completed, the *burning of the offering followed* (1). In the burnt-offering, *all the flesh and the fat pieces* were consumed after those parts had been washed which required cleansing (Lev. i. 7–9); in the other offerings, only the fat pieces.—As to the *meaning* of the burning, there is neither in the ritual of sacrifice nor elsewhere in the Old Testament, any support whatever for the view, still defended, especially by Hengstenberg, according to which this ceremony shows that sin is not expiated by death, but that there is still a punishment impending after death—namely, that of hell-fire,

the symbol whereof is the fire of the altar. The true point of the burning on the altar is clear from the fact that not the term שָׂרַף, which designates *destructive* burning, is used for it (comp. on the contrary, Lev. iv. 12, xvi. 27), but always הִקְטִיר (Lev. i. 9, 13, 17; also of the sin-offering, iv. 10, 19, etc.), which literally means [קָטַר to smoke] "to cause to *smoke* or steam"—that is, to cause to ascend in smoke and vapor. The burning of the offering does certainly complete the *surrender* of it on the part of the offerer, and for him the gift is destroyed, but only in such a way that at the same time the *acceptance* of the gift on the part of God ensues—an odor, which is well-pleasing to God, being produced as the smoke and vapor of the burnt-offering, "the real essence" of the offering (as Kurtz, *Das mosaische Opfer*, p. 91, well expresses it), rises upward, so that He is thus made to enjoy the offering, which is what is meant by the regularly-recurring formula, אִשֶּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוה (Lev. i. 9, 13, 17). How could the vapor of the offering be so called, if the fire of the altar were a fire of punishment, and the burning offering the symbol of those burning in hell? (This view is truly hideous.) The symbolic interpretation of the expression is required by the Mosaic idea of God, in accordance with which a sensuous enjoyment on the part of God cannot be spoken of (2). But the *fire* which consumes the offering is originally *one coming from God*, because thereby God appropriates the offering (Lev. ix. 24; comp. in later times, Judg. vi. 21; 1 Kings xiii. 38; 1 Chron. xxi. 26; 2 Chron. vii. 1). It must *never go out on the altar*, but must be continually nourished by the burnt-offering and the fat of the peace-offering, Lev. vi. 5 f. (12 f.); and this regulation does not simply mean that the fire of the offering must always be ready, but is meant to preserve the identity of the fire on the altar with the original heavenly fire, and to represent at the same time the unbroken course of the adoration of Jehovah carried on in sacrifice. All fire for the offerings of incense had to be taken from this sacred fire on the altar of burnt-offerings,—a thing which is not, indeed, expressly commanded in the law, but was set forth practically by the heavy punishment inflicted on the sons of Aaron, who approached the Lord in the offering of incense with strange fire (Lev. x). This heaven-born fire is the symbol of the divine holiness which reveals itself in Israel. That God accepts every offered gift only by means of the element which proceeds directly from Him, is intended to teach that every sacrifice which man makes to God is made perfect only by being taken up into the purifying, sanctifying element of divine life (comp. Mark ix. 49). The latter, indeed, becomes (Lev. x. 2) a consuming fire for those who approach the Holy One in a profane spirit. Thus it is clear how the hearth of God (Isa. xxxi. 9; *Ariel*, Ezek. xliii. 15 f.) is not merely symbolical of the way in which God sanctifies His people, but also of His punitive justice, which annihilates all that resists Him. In this sense Isa. xxxiii. 14 says: "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" (Comp. also Isa. x. 17 and § 48 on this passage; Mal. iii. 19.)

(1) But first the offerer had to take off the skin of the animal, and to divide it "into its pieces" (Lev. i. 6, viii. 20); that is, not to hack it into rude lumps, but to dissect it properly. The inspection of the intestines, which constituted an essential part of the sacrificial transaction among many ancient nations, especially

the Phœnicians (comp. Movers, *Das Opferwesen der Karthager*, p. 65), is entirely banished from the Mosaic worship.

(2) Even on the *Homeric* view, it is not the pleasure of enjoying the vapor of the offering in itself, but the readiness of man to honor God with this enjoyment, which makes the offering acceptable; comp. Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* p. 352.

§ 129.

Ritual of the Food-Offering.

The ritual of the food-offering was very simple. At those food-offerings which accompanied the burnt-offerings presented for the congregation, it is probable—there is no certain command—that the whole quantity of flour, oil, and incense was burnt on the altar (1). At *free-will food-offerings* (comp. Lev. ii. and vi. 7 ff.), the offerer brought the material to the priest, who took a handful of the flour and oil (מְלֹא קֳמְצוֹ, ii. 2, comp. vi. 8), together with the whole of the incense, and burned it on the altar. The name for the portion of the food-offering which was placed on the altar, as well as for the incense laid on the shewbread (Lev. xxiv. 7), is אַזְכָּרָה, which is interpreted most plausibly by the LXX *μνημόσυνον* (Vulgate, *memoriale*), and thus expresses that the odor of the food-offering, when burnt, was to bring the offerer into God's gracious remembrance; as, on the contrary, the offering of jealousy, Num. v. 15, is called מַזְכֶּרֶת עָוֹן מַזְכֶּרֶת זִכָּרוֹן, which brings sin to remembrance (2). The food-offerings accompanying peace-offerings will be treated of along with these.—The law makes no provisions concerning the manner of procedure in the *drink-offering*. According to Sir. l. 15 (17), the wine was poured out at the foot of the altar; according to Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 9. 4, around the altar (and this, say the Rabbins, after it had first been salted). The libation, as is probable *a priori*, is said to have been the last act of the offering (3).

(1) See Keil, *Archäologie*, i. p. 255 f.; Winer, *Reallexikon*, ed. 3, ii. p. 494. The latter assumes that the food-offerings mentioned in Lev. xiv. 20 f., Num. vi. 15 ff., viii. 8 ff., were also completely consumed on the altar. In the law, on the contrary, this was expressly prescribed only for the priestly Minhha, Lev. vi. 16 (comp. § 95), which was a matter of course, since the person who made the offering was not to partake of his own Minhha.

(2) Bähr's explanation of the אַזְכָּרָה (1st ed. *l.c.* i. p. 411, ii. p. 328) by "praise" is supported by the phrase הַזְכִּיר שֵׁם יהוה, but does not agree well with Lev. v. 12, Num. v. 26; Knobel's rendering—*remembrance* = gift, tribute—cannot adduce proof for the use of זָכַר which it assumes; Ewald's interpretation, *odor*, is quite destitute of linguistic proof. [It has been accepted, however, by H. Schultz (p. 456), Köhler (i. 392 f.), and Dillmann (on Lev. ii. 2). The main objection urged against the explanation in the text, is that the assumed Aramaicizing Hiphil formation of a word belonging to the ancient sacrificial language is improbable.]—The remainder of the Minhha fell to the priests, and was to be consumed in the front court as a thing most holy—of course after the flour mingled with oil had been baked without leaven (Lev. ii. 3, 10, vi. 9 f., vii. 6 f.). [Above art.]

(3) See Lund, *l.c.* p. 596, where there are more particulars.

3. ON THE VARIOUS KINDS OF OFFERINGS WITH REFERENCE TO THEIR PURPOSE.

§ 130.

Various Kinds of Offerings as thus distinguished.

The law of offering distinguishes, with reference to their design, four kinds of offerings,—*burnt*, *peace*, *sin*, and *trespass* offerings. The laws in Lev. i.–iii. relate to the two first kinds, which are referred to one divine injunction, i. 1 ("and Jehovah called to Moses, and said to him," etc.); between the two the regulations for food-offerings are inserted, because these stood in connection with the animal-offerings mentioned (comp. Num. xv. 3 ff.). They stand, however, in closer connection with the burnt-offering, and therefore follow immediately upon it. In chap. iv. f. (again in close connection, but traced to various divine disclosures, iv. 1, v. 14, 20) follow those species of offerings newly introduced by the Mosaic ritual, the sin-offering (up to v. 13) and the trespass-offering.—By this grouping we are led to refer the four kinds of offerings to *two principal classes*,—those which assume that the covenant relation is on the whole *undisturbed*, and those that are meant to *remove a disturbance* which has entered into this relation, and to restore the right relation (of the people or of separate individuals) to God. The latter are offerings of atonement, under which name we may comprehend both sin- and trespass-offerings. If several offerings were to be presented at the same time, the offerings of atonement generally preceded the burnt-offerings, and on the latter the peace-offerings followed. In respect to *rank* (1), the offering of atonement, as קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, a thing *most holy* (vi. 18, 22, vii. 1, 6, etc.), stands higher than the peace-offering, which, like presented first-fruits, is expressly called simply קֹדֶשׁ, a holy thing. But since the food-offerings also are called most holy (ii. 3, 10, vi. 10, x. 12), the designation קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים is probably omitted only by accident in speaking of the burnt-offering, which certainly was an offering of the higher rank. The distinction is clearly connected with the partaking of the offering. Offerings a portion of which the man who brings them receives and partakes of are simply holy, and so are offerings of the second grade; while, on the contrary, those entirely withdrawn from man's use, or such that the priests alone were allowed to partake of them, were most holy (hence this designation is used also of the shew-bread). It is explained by what has been said, why in the enumeration of the kinds of offerings in Lev. vii. 37 (2), the peace-offering stands last. The מִלּוּאִים there mentioned, the offering at the dedication of the priests, which has already been treated of under the consecration of the priests (§ 95), was a modified thank-offering.

(1) The ritual (§ 127) points to a difference of rank among the offerings, by the differences in the manipulation of the blood.

(2) Lev. vii. 37: לָעוֹלָה לַמִּנְחָה וְלַחַטָּאת וְלָאָשָׁם וְלַמִּלּוּאִים וּלְזֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים.

(*a*) THE BURNT-OFFERING

§ 131.

The ordinary name of the *burnt-offering*, עֹלָה, is not, with Ewald, to be derived from a stem, עול, which he supposes to signify *to glow*, *to burn* (Arabic, *ala*) (in which case the name would come from long burning) (1), but from עָלָה, as is shown by the continual conjunction of the word with הֶעֱלָה; while on the contrary, הִקְרִיב, הִגִּישׁ, זָבַח, are used of the other kinds of offerings. It means that which *ascends*,—namely, on the altar,—in distinction from the offerings of which only portions came upon the altar. The interpretation of Bähr, Keil, Delitzsch [and Dillmann]—"that which rises upward to God in the fire"—is less probable. [?] The other name of this offering, כָּלִיל, that is, the complete or *whole burnt-offering*, occurs only in poetical passages (Deut. xxxiii. 10; Ps. li. 21 [19] (2). The animal sacrificed must (Lev. i.), in accordance with the high rank of the offering, be a *male*, without blemish, taken from among the most perfect of the beasts of sacrifice (from the cattle, sheep, or goats) (3). After the skin had been taken off (which was the perquisite of the priest, vii. 8), and the offal removed, the animal was *wholly* burnt (הַכֹּל, i. 9) on the altar, and the blood was sprinkled round it. On the food and drink-offerings connected with the burnt-offerings, see the law in Num. xv. 8 ff.

In this offering, the people and the individual expressed in a general way their *adoration* of Jehovah and their *devotion* to him. It is, as it has been suitably named, the *sacrificium latreuticum*. In virtue of the presentation of blood connected with it, and as a fire-offering of pleasant odor (רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ), it is also *propitiatory* (appeasing) in general; it serves, Lev. i. 3, to make him who offers it *acceptable before Jehovah* לִרְצוֹנוֹ לִפְנֵי יהוה—indeed in virtue of this acceptableness, it serves as a covering or atonement for the offerer (לְכַפֵּר, ver. 4; comp. xiv. 20, xvi. 24). The law knows nothing of a special destination of the burnt-offering to atone for a special sort of sins.—As the *sacrificium latreuticum*, it was the *morning* and *evening sacrifice* presented daily in the name of the people (the embodiment of morning and evening prayer), for which a yearling lamb was always used. This is called the *continual* burnt-offering (עֹלַת תָּמִיד). The law touching it is given as early as the organization of the sanctuary itself (Ex. xxix. 38–42), and then repeated (Num. xxviii. 3–8). Every day was dedicated to God by the עֹלַת תָּמִיד, and, as the Rabbins emphatically set forth, was thus atoned for; with its cessation the ceremonial service itself is suspended (and so this is regarded as a great calamity, see Dan. viii. 11). No time is set for the morning sacrifice (according to *Mishna Tamid* iii. 2, as soon as it became light); the evening sacrifice is to be presented בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם (between the two evenings), Ex. xxix. 39, 41. This expression, which occurs frequently in the Pentateuch (also in the Paschal law), has long been variously interpreted by the Jews. According to the Karaites (who appeal to Deut. xvi. 6) and the Samaritans (likewise Aben Ezra), it means the time between sunset and total darkness; according to the Pharisees, between the hour when the sun declines (three o'clock in the afternoon) and sunset (3); while Kimchi and Rashi (and, in modern times, Hitzig)

say that sunset was the boundary-line between the two evenings (4). The evening sacrifice was intended, Lev. vi. 9, to burn through the whole night till the morning. Probably at the same time as the עֹלַת תָּמִיד was presented, the offering of incense, also presented twice daily, was kindled on the inner altar (already spoken of in § 117). The time for presenting the offering was also the hour of prayer (Dan. ix. 21; Acts. iii. 1), as, generally speaking, it is likely that an act of prayer was combined with the burnt-offering (comp. 2 Chron. xxix. 27–30). With the morning and evening sacrifice were also combined a food- and drink-offering; between these two, tradition makes the high priest's food-offering to have been presented, for which reference is made to the law in Lev. vi. 12–16 (19–23) (5); comp. Sir. xlv. 14 (17).—The Sabbath, the new moon, and the feasts were marked by an increased burnt-offering, Num. xxviii. 9 ff. See in 2 Chron. xxix. 27–30 a description of the form of the festal burnt-offerings in the temple at a later time (6).—Even strangers who wished to honor Jehovah might (Lev. xvii. 8, xxii. 18, 25) offer burnt-offerings and sacrifices (7).

(1) See Ewald, *Antiquities*, p. 47.—By the LXX, עֹלָה is generally translated ὁλοκαύτωμα, sometimes also ὁλοκάρπωμα.

(2) The term כָּלִיל refers to the complete burning; compare the use of the word for the priestly Minhha, which was also to be completely burnt (Lev. vi. 15 f., and also Deut. xiii. 17). The word has a more comprehensive meaning in the Phenician ritual; there it is a designation of sacrifice in general, as is to be concluded from the Punic sacrificial tablet found in Marseilles. See Movers, *l.c.* p. 59 ff.; Ewald, *Bibl. Jahrb.* i. p. 211.

(3) So, also, for the sin-offerings of higher rank, male animals are commanded to be used.—It was only for turtle-doves and young pigeons offered by the poor that the sex was not prescribed. [Above art.]

(4) This was the practice in the temple; according to *Mishna Pesachim* v. 1, the evening offering was slaughtered half an hour after the eighth hour of the day (that is, about half past two o'clock), and offered half an hour after the ninth (half past three). [Above art.]

(5) As the evening comprehends the whole time immediately before and after sunset, it may be reckoned partly to the past day as its close (comp. Lev. xxiii. 32), and partly to the next day as its beginning; by the latter usage, for example, לְמָחֳרָתָם, in 1 Sam. xxx. 17, finds its explanation (see Thenius on this passage). The expression עַרְבַּיִם is probably to be primarily traced to this division of the evening, just as צָהֳרַיִם, properly "the pair of lights," denotes mid-day as the time before and after the highest position of the sun (see Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache*, ed. 8, p. 475 f.). Comp. also Gesenius, *Thesaur.* ii. p. 1064 f. [and Dillmann on Ex., xii. 6].

(6) See Lund, *l.c.* pp. 921 and 928.—The high priest had to offer it for the first time on the day of his anointing (מִנְחַת חִנּוּךְ) (comp. § 95, note 22), and then to offer the same for himself every day (מִנְחַת חֲבִתִּין, that is, food-offering in the pan), half in the morning and half in the evening; and this he did (Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 10. 7) out of his own means, presenting it either himself or by a substitute. Against the view, still defended by Keil (*Archäol.* i. p. 174 f.) and others, which entirely denies the existence of this daily Minhha of the high priest, see the exact discussion of this point by Thalhofer, *l.c.* p. 139 ff.; comp. Delitzsch, *Comment. on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ii. p. 8 f.

(7) As soon as the act of offering began, the choir of Levites struck up a psalm, in which they were joined by the trumpets of the priests. During the whole service the assembled congregation stood praying; at the close, they threw themselves upon their knees, and then most likely received the priestly blessing. It

followed from the fact that the meaning of the burnt-offering is of a general kind, that it was sometimes united with special offerings. In acts of atonement it generally followed the sin-offering, and at public thanksgivings and other festivities formed a basis for the thank-offering, etc. ; see the collection by Knobel on Lev. i. 3, in Dillmann, p. 379 ff.

(8) Comp. *Mishna Shekalim* vii. 6.—Especially since the time of Alexander the Great, the heathen rulers of the Jews caused burnt-offerings to be offered for them ; and Augustus actually instituted a daily burnt-offering of two lambs and a bullock for himself (Philo, *leg. ad Caj.* § 40). This offering was a sign of acknowledgment of his imperial majesty (comp. Josephus, *c. Ap.* ii. 6) ; and therefore when, at the beginning of the Jewish war, the acceptance of any offering from a Gentile was declined at the instigation of Eleazar, the rejection of the emperor's offering came to be regarded as an open breach with the Roman Government (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 2). Comp. on this point especially Lund, *l.c.* p. 634 f.

(*b*) THE PEACE-OFFERING.

§ 132.

Its Name, Notion, and Division.

The name of this sacrifice (זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים) (1) may be explained in a twofold manner. According to the Rabbinic view (2), it is derived from the Kal שָׁלַם, *integer fuit*, to be entire. Hence שְׁלֹמִי, Ps. vii. 4, he who is in a peaceful or friendly relation to me. This makes the name of the sacrifice declare that the offerer is in a relation of integrity, a relation of peace and friendship with God. Accordingly the LXX render the words by *εἰρηνικὴ θυσία* and sometimes by *σωτήριον*, the Vulgate by *sacrificia pacifica* (3), moderns by *peace-* or *thank-offering*. That such an idea is at all events included in that of the peace-offering, is evident from the fact that, in those cases in which these sacrifices appear in conjunction with sin-offerings, the latter (as also burnt-offerings) are to be offered first ; comp. Lev. ix. 18, Num. vi. 16, etc. Thus the peace-offering is manifestly a declaration that a relation of perfect peace between Jehovah and the offerer is restored by means of the atonement effected. A *second* explanation of the expression (4), however, refers it to the Piel שִׁלֵּם, *to compensate*, to which the noun שֶׁלֶם is said to be related in the same manner as כֹּפֶר, atonement, to כִּפֶּר (5). In support of this explanation, it may be advanced that the Piel שִׁלֵּם is the technical term for the act of offering this sacrifice, for it is frequently used in combination with נְדָרִים (vows, which are a kind of שְׁלָמִים), Deut. xxiii. 22, etc., and also with תּוֹדוֹת (offerings of thanksgiving), Ps. lvi. 13 ; nay, in Hos. xiv. 2, to offer calves as peace-offerings is called שַׁלֵּם פָּרִים. Care must, however, be taken, if this derivation is adopted, not to limit the שְׁלָמִים to the specific notion of the *thank-offering*, for the former not only include the *sacrificia eucharistica*, but undoubtedly also the *sacrificia impetratoria*, the supplicatory offerings ; for which reason peace-offerings are offered, *e.g.* 1 Sam. xiii. 9, before commencing a battle, and Judg. xx. 26, xxi. 4, 2 Sam. xxiv. 25, when public misfortunes had been suffered. Hence the שֶׁלֶם must be understood in a more general sense as a return not only for some benefit already obtained, but also for *one still desired ;* in short, as a testimony that to God alone are we indebted for whatever we receive or hope for (6). These offerings were called זְבָחִים (זָבַח signifying to

slay with reference to eating), because a *sacrificial repast* was one of their essential elements, while the consumption of the entire sacrifice on the *altar* was peculiar to the burnt-offering. In the Pentateuch this narrower use of זָבַח is adhered to, the word being never there used of an atoning sacrifice; nor can such usage be proved of the subsequent books of the Old Testament (7), for in Ps. li. 18 the thank-offerings of the justified (Hupfeld, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch) are spoken of. (Moreover, for blood-guiltiness, no sin-offering could be brought.)

With respect also to the *division* of the peace-offerings, various opinions have been entertained, since the chief passage on this matter, Lev. vii. 11 sqq., admits of different interpretations. According to Hengstenberg (*Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1852, p. 134), the term used, ver. 12 sq., זֶבַח עַל־תּוֹדָה (sacrifice of thanksgiving, A.V.), does not designate one kind of peace-offering, but is another name for the whole species, and indicates the emotions which are expressed by these sacrifices. Hence there would be only *two kinds* of peace-offerings (comp. xxii. 18, 21), viz. נְדָרִים and נְדָבוֹת both being תּוֹדָה (on account of thankfulness), comp. Ps. liv. 8, lvi. 13, cvi. 18. This view makes it impossible to understand the injunction concerning the flesh of the sacrifice, Lev. vii. 15 in its relation with 16–18, in its natural meaning. Besides, it must be observed that a זֶבַח, differing from the נְדָרִים and נְדָבוֹת, is also mentioned xxiii. 37 and Deut. xii. 6. According to the *usual* and correct view, *three kinds* are distinguished in the above-cited passage of Leviticus, viz. 1, זֶבַח תּוֹדָה (or, as it is called, vers. 13 and 15, זֶבַח תּוֹדַת שְׁלָמִים), the thank or praise offering; 2, נֶדֶר the vow; and 3, נְדָבָה, the free-will offering. The difference, however, between the thank-offering and the two others can hardly be so defined (as by Ewald, *Antiquities of Israel*, p. 52) as to make the latter a sacrifice of greater solemnity and excellence because of the psalms and hymns with which the singers and musicians accompanied it. On the contrary, it was probably this: the זֶבַח תּוֹדָה being offered without having been previously promised for some benefit received, and thus referring to a favor not already supplicated (8), was the highest among the שְׁלָמִים. The vow, נֶדֶר, on the contrary, is a promised offering usually presented *after the reception* of some benefit previously entreated; yet the one making a promise might connect an offering immediately with his prayer, and it would fall under this species; but the נֶדֶר always refers to something distinctly prayed for. And lastly, the נְדָבָה is every free gift for which there was no other occasion than the will of the offerer, whom his heart impelled to show his thankful sense of all the blessings which the goodness of God had bestowed on him. Comp. especially Deut. xvi. 10; and in explanation of the expression, Ex. xxxv. 29 (אֲשֶׁר נָדַב לִבָּם אֹתָם) and xxv. 2 (אֲשֶׁר יִדְּבֶנּוּ לִבּוֹ). The נְדָבָה, of which a general feeling of love to God is the impelling cause, would thus be contrasted not merely with the obligation laid upon the offerer by a vow, but also with sacrifices occasioned by some special benefit (9). In the two first kinds, the precepts concerning the unblemished nature of the victim were to be observed, the requirements being, according to Lev. xxii. 23, less strict in the case of the נְדָבָה (10).

(1) A single offering of this kind is thus designated in the Pentateuch. The singular שֶׁלֶם occurs in the Old Testament only in Amos v. 22.

(2) Embraced, among recent writers, especially by Neumann, *Sacra N. T. salutaria*, 1854, p. 18 sqq.

(3) The only fault to be found with the latter translation is that it makes it appear as if peace were not made with God until this sacrifice was offered, while in fact the offering presupposes that this peace already exists, and is intended only to confirm and strengthen it. [Dillmann on Lev. iii. 1 objects to this explanation, at least to the turn of the thought as conveying a contrast with sin- and trespass-offerings, that the name could not have originally had this signification, because the שְׁלָמִים, both in fact and in name, were much older than the sin-offering. From the added clause, "which he shall bring near to Jehovah," or "which are for Jehovah," he infers that there must have been other זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים which were not for Jehovah, and consequently not offerings, and so feels obliged to understand the words as originally expressing a repast of peace and friendship.]

(4) This view has recently been advocated by Hofmann ; comp. his apt remarks in his *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 2d ed. p. 227, and by Knobel on Lev. iii. 1.

(5) On the frequent coincidence in meaning of nouns derived from the Kal, with the Piel of their verb, comp. Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb. der Hebr. Sprache*, § 150*b*.

(6) Just as in the Psalms God is frequently thanked beforehand for help which is expected, and as שְׁלוֹם, שַׁלְמֹנִים, Isa. i. 23, Mic. vii. 3, signifies a remuneration to the judge for some favor to be granted (comp. Hofmann, *ib*). But even in this view of the שֶׁלֶם the fact must not be lost sight of, that this offering presupposes the existence of a friendly relation between God and the offerer, and is intended to express his thankfulness for manifestations of Divine goodness bestowed or to be bestowed on account of this relation.

(7) In the subsequent books of the Old Testament, זֶבַח is occasionally used in a wider sense, signifying sometimes (especially when combined with מִנְחָה) bloody sacrifices in general, sometimes such sacrifices with the exclusion of the עֹלָה. Still, the examples adduced by Gusset, *Lex. Hebr.* ed. 2, 415, Neumann, p. 7 ff, and others, require much sifting, and many passages where the wider meaning has been assumed refer only to the שְׁלָמִים. [So *e.g.* as the connection shows, in Jer. vii. 22, comp. 21 and xvii. 26.]

(8) Properly a sacrifice of confession (according to the original meaning of תּוֹדָה), of grateful acknowledgment for Divine favors as undeserved as they were unexpected.

(9) These distinctions are, for want of more exact definitions, comparatively conjectural.

(10) Even animals with limbs abnormally long or short might be offered. Free-will offerings of money for the repair of the sanctuary and its vessels were also reckoned among the נְדָבוֹת in their wider sense (Ex. xxv. 2, xxxv. 21). The only remark to be made on the *material* of the peace-offering is that cattle, sheep, or goats of *both sexes* might be used (Lev. iii. 6), though even here preference seems to have been given to males (comp. such passages as ix. 4, 18, Num. vii. 17 sqq.), and that pigeons are never mentioned. The peace-offering was, like the burnt-offering, accompanied by a meat and a drink offering, for it is evident from Num. xv. 3 that what is prescribed concerning the sacrifice of thanksgiving, Lev. vii. 12, applies also to the other two kinds.

§ 133.

The Ritual of the Peace-Offering.

In the ritual of the peace-offering, the proceedings were, down to and including the sprinkling of the blood, identical with those practised at the burnt-offering (comp. Lev. iii. 2), except that, as already remarked, § 126, the slaying

of the animal was not restricted to the north side of the altar. On the other hand, a proceeding essentially differing from the ritual of the burnt-offering took place after the sprinkling of the blood. The whole animal was not placed upon the altar, but the fat alone was removed at the cutting up of the animal and afterward burnt (Lev. iii. 3–5, 9–11, 14–16, ix. 19 sq.). This fat consisted, in the case of oxen and goats, of four, in that of sheep, of five parts. The fat interspersed in the flesh was not sacrificed, and the prohibition of fat as food relates only to these separable portions (Lev. vii. 23–25). The *reason* for burning these fatty portions on the altar was that they were regarded as the choice parts of the animal. After the removal of the fat, the offerer of a private peace-offering was to bring with his own hand not only this, but also the wave-breast (חֲזֵה) (1) and the right שׁוֹק (according to the general view—LXX, *βραχίων*; Vulgate, *armus*—the right shoulder, therefore a fore leg; according to Knobel, the right hind leg, the right thigh) to the priest as a heave-offering (Lev. vii. 29–34). This brings us to discuss the ceremony of the *waving* or swinging (תְּנוּפָה, הֲנִיף), as well as the question, what relation this had to that of *heaving* (תְּרוּמָה, הֵרִים). Besides the case just mentioned, the former occurred also at the peace-offerings enjoined at the consecration of priests (Lev. vii. 29–34) and the dedication of Nazarites (Num. vi. 20), at the jealousy-offering (ver. 25), at the trespass-offering of the leper (Lev. xiv. 12), at the offering of the sheaf of new grain at the Passover, and the loaves of first-ripe grain and peace-offering lambs at the Feast of Weeks (2). According to Jewish tradition, which coincides with the intimations given in Ex. xxix. 24, Lev. viii. 27, etc., it consisted in the priest's laying the matter to be waved upon the hands of the offerer (3), placing his hands under those of the latter, and moving them in a horizontal direction—backward and forward, according to the Talmud (מוֹלִיךְ וּמֵבִיא), and also toward the right and left, that is, toward the four quarters of the heavens, according to some later Rabbins. Of the *meaning* of the transaction, in the simpler form in which the Talmud describes it, no doubt can exist, when it is considered that the waving took place almost exclusively in the case of such portions of sacrifices as were *allotted to the priests as a gift from Jehovah* (4). The swinging forward evidently denoted the presentation of the gift to God,—it was a declaration in action that it properly belonged to Him; while the moving it backward again indicated that God on His part returned the gift, and assigned it to the priest. In the view connected, on the other hand, with the Rabbinical explanation, according to which the ceremony is said to allude to the universal government of God, it is not easy to see why such an acknowledgment of the Divine omnipresence (as Sykes, *Ueber die Opfer*, edited by Semler, pp. 36, 54, designates the wave-offering) should take place just with those portions of the sacrifices which were relinquished to the priests (5). We next proceed to the *heaving*, which also, according to most of the Rabbins, who are followed in this respect by many modern writers, particularly by Kurtz, was a *special ceremony*, a moving upward and downward of portions of the sacrifice with reference to the God who rules in heaven and on earth. In some instances combined with the wave-offering, in others practised independently, viz. in the case of those portions of a sacrifice which were burnt as exclusively belonging to God, the memorial (*askara*, of the meat-offering and

the fat, Lev. ii. 9, iv. 8, 10, etc.), whence it has been remarked that, generally speaking, heaving and burning appear in combination. The ceremony of heaving likewise took place with the above-named heave-shoulder (הַתְּרוּמָה שׁוֹק).– But though unquestionably a separate ceremony of heaving occurs in the *later Jewish ritual*, this *cannot be pointed out in the Pentateuch* (6). Especially is it to be observed that in the passages on sacrifice, הֵרִים is never combined with אֶל־יְהוָה, or, as הֵנִיף is, with לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, but with לַיהוָה (we also meet with תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה, the heave belonging to Jehovah), and that the מִן partitive is generally used with the word, to specify from what whole the heave is to be taken (comp. Lev. ii. 9, iv. 8, 10, vi. 8, etc.) (7). The expression תְּרוּמָה, moreover, elsewhere signifies nothing else than what is taken away, what is separated from the whole to be offered to the Lord. In this sense it is used of the first-born, the tenth, the devoted, the Lord's share of the spoil (Num. xv. 19 sq., xviii. 11 sq., xxxi. 41, etc.), the word denoting in general the sacred tribute (comp. Lev. xxii. 12; Num. v. 9). This meaning is also suitable in the passages concerning sacrifice; nor are we obliged in a single instance to accept a special ceremony of heaving. Thus שׁוֹק תְּרוּמָה also is the shoulder or thigh, which, after the Lord has received His part and relinquished the breast of it to the priest, is relinquished or taken off on the part of the offerer in favor of the officiating priest.—After the separation of the wave-breast, the rest of the flesh was the portion of the offerers, to be used by them as a *sacrificial feast* in the sanctuary, in which all the members of their families and other guests might participate. Levitical cleanness was indispensable in all who ate of the sacrifices; any one who should, in spite of any uncleanness he might have incurred, eat thereof, was to be cut off. In the case of the thank-offering, the flesh was to be consumed on the same day (vii. 15, xxii. 29 sq.); in that of other sacrifices, on the second at farthest; if any remained till the third day, it was to be burned (vii. 16 sq., xix. 6 sq.) (8). The *signification* of this sacrificial repast was not (as Bähr, *Symbolik*, 1st ed. ii. p. 374, and others suppose), that Jehovah, as proprietor of the flesh which was offered, was the host, and they who fed thereon His guests; on the contrary, it was rather God who condescended to be the guest of the offerer, receiving the breast as His portion of honor, and then relinquishing it to His servant the priest. Thus the repast was *a pledge of the blessed fellowship* into which He would enter with His people among whom He dwelt (9). It was also to be a *love-feast*, at which, besides the members of the family, the Levites (Deut. xii. 18) and (as prescribed, Deut. xvi. 11, in the case of the peace-offerings at Pentecost) the needy were to find refreshment. Niggardliness was prevented by the prohibition of a longer keeping of the flesh; still, the principal reason of the injunction to consume it before the third day, may have lain in the likelihood of corruption taking place. In the thank-offering, the highest kind of peace-offering, the danger of impurity it was necessary to guard against most carefully.

(1) "The breast, which in oxen, sheep, and goats is called the brisket, consists mostly of gristly fat, and is one of the best-flavored portions" (Knobel).

(2) In the case both of the last named and of the trespass-offering lamb of the leper, it took place with the whole animal *before* it was slain.

(3) With respect to this part of the transaction, the LXX denote it by *ἐπιτιθέναι*, *ἐπίθεμα*.

(4) This refers also, according to Num. viii. 19, to the wave of the Levites.—On the meaning of the ceremony, Lev. viii. 25 sq., see § 95.

(5) Compare on this point especially Keil, *Archæol.* i. p. 253.

(6) In this respect, with Dillmann, I entirely coincide with Knobel on Lev. vii. 33, in opposition to Kurtz. Comp. also on this point, Keil, *Archæol.* p. 244 sq.; Gesenius, too, who in his *Thesaurus*, ii. p. 866, embraced the usual view, subsequently renounced it, iii. p. 1277.

(7) The הֵרִים מִן, Lev. ii. 9, corresponds with the קָמִץ מִן of ver. 2, and the הוּסַר, in vers. 31 and 35, with the הוּרַם in Lev. iv. 10.

(8) This was also prescribed with respect to such flesh of sacrifices as had come in contact with anything unclean (Lev. vii. 19). The fact that the peace-offering terminated in a repast explains the circumstance that, according to Lev. vii. 13, besides the unleavened bread of the meat-offering, leavened bread was also to be offered, which, however, was not laid on the altar, but was simply eaten with the flesh at the ensuing meal. It is utterly unnecessary to understand the passage as declaring that the unleavened meat-offering itself was offered upon a layer of leavened bread. See Knobel and Dillmann on the passage.

(9) It is self-evident that cleanness was exacted of all participators in such an act of communion: its opposite would have been an act of flagrant contempt on the part of the invited guests, hence the threat of severe punishment, Lev. xii. 20 f.

§ 134.

Of Vows (1).

The *idea of the vow* extends much farther than to those vowed sacrifices properly so called (discussed in § 132). For the vow *positive*, the promise to dedicate something to God may refer not *merely to a sacrifice*, but to the dedication of some other object; and besides this, there is the vow *negative*, the promise to *renounce some act or enjoyment for the glory of God.* It is only with reference to the positive vow that the word נֶדֶר is used in the law (with the exception of Num. vi. 5), while the negative vow (the forswearing, as it had been called, in opposition to swearing) is designated by אִסָּר or אֱסָר, *obligatio* (Num. xxx. 3 sq.), or more fully by שְׁבֻעַת אִסָּר לְעַנּוֹת נֶפֶשׁ (ver. 14).—The positive vow first appears in the Old Testament in Gen. xxviii. 20-22, as a promise to erect a place of worship, and might extend to persons, even the person of the vower, to animals and to lands. Persons were dedicated to the service of the sanctuary (thus Hannah vowed her son, 1 Sam. i. 11); and it is probably on this ground that the circumstance of women being employed in the sanctuary (Ex. xxxviii. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 22 (2)) is to be explained. Persons and lands *might*, unclean animals *must*, be redeemed at an appointed valuation—see the law, Lev. xxvii. 1–25 (3); clean animals, on the other hand, which had been vowed, were always to be sacrificed (ver. 9 sq.). Of course that which was already due to God (ver. 26) could not become the subject of a vow, neither could aught connected with crime or infamy; comp. Deut. xxiii. 18 (4). Anything which had *fallen under the curse* could only be the subject of the חֵרֶם. This word signifies "a being cut off," *i.e.* from the ordinary connection of life; for to be subjected to the Hherem, the vow of extermination, is to have forfeited existence. The Hherem might be carried into execution either in consequence of a Divine command or of a special kind of vow, *the vow of devotion;* comp., as the chief passage on this subject, Lev. xxvii. 38 sq.

Nothing devoted could be redeemed. If the vow related to anything living, it must be put to death; lands which had been devoted were irredeemable and unsalable, the priests having the right of possession, see ver. 21. Of course this vow, the Hherem, might not be arbitrarily vowed, otherwise the laws of imprecation would have been in irreconcilable opposition to other laws. Only (as may be inferred from Ex. xxii. 19, Deut. xiii. 16) that which had incurred the *judgment due to idolatry* could be thus placed under the ban. Hence the vow of extermination must be regarded as a *manifestation of zeal for Jehovah's honor.*

Among vows of abstinence, the most usual was that of *fasting*, which, *except on the Day of Atonement* (Lev. xvi. 29, xxiii. 27, of which hereafter, § 140), was quite voluntary, and therefore often appears as the expression of penitence (comp. *e.g.* 1 Sam. vii. 6, Joel ii. 12, etc.), or of mourning in general. It is not till after the captivity that we meet with various other annual fasts (of which hereafter). The Pentateuch makes use of the expression עִנּוֹת נֶפֶשׁ, to afflict the soul (compare, besides the already quoted passages, Num. xxx. 14), for fasting, in which the special significance of fasting is expressed; some indulgence, otherwise allowable, must be denied to the natural will, to testify to the earnestness of its penitence and grief. It is characteristic of the moral spirit of Mosaism, that it strictly forbids all unnatural austerities, such as maiming or mutilating the limbs, branding, and the like (Lev. xix. 28; Deut. xiv. 1 sq., xxiii. 2 sq.), for it is said, Deut. xiv. 1 sq., "Thou art a holy people." (Eunuchs were on this account excluded from the congregation.)

The *permission of vows* is best understood in its subjective aspect, from the educational standpoint of the law. To be bound by an oath might support the weakness and fickleness of the natural will, and give energy to a prayer or a resolution. Still a vow was never regarded as specially meritorious. "If thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin unto thee," Deut. xxiii. 22. Of course, if a vow were once made, its performance was strictly insisted on, Num. xxx. 3, Deut. xxiii. 22–24 (5); at the same time, however, it was enacted that the vow of a daughter in her father's house, or of a wife, was only binding if her father or husband confirmed it by silence. Inconsiderate vows are expressly reproved, Prov. xx. 25, and Eccl. v. 3–5. The heathen view of a vow, as forming a kind of compact with the Deity, by means of which a claim upon Divine interposition was acquired on the part of him who makes it, may indeed be found in the form of the Old Testament vow (if thou doest so to me, I will do so and so) from Gen. xxviii. 20 sq. onward; but the notion that God will be influenced to grant a petition by an external performance as such, is opposed, Ps. lxvi. 18, by the words, "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me," after the fulfilment of vows had been previously spoken of, vers. 13–15; while in Ps. l. 14, also, the offering of *thanksgiving* is regarded as the right fulfilment of vows (6).

(1) Comp. my article, "Gelübde bei den Hebräern," in Herzog; also, Riehm in his *Handwörterbuch.*

(2) The sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, however, is not to be included here (comp. § 159). On the *Nethinim*, whose origin was undoubtedly a different one, see § 166.

(3) For persons, the price of redemption differed according to age and sex; in the case of the poor, it was also determined according to property, Lev. xxvii. 1–8. For

unclean animals, houses, and hereditary land, the price was determined by the priests (in hereditary lands, according to the probable value of the crops until the year of jubilee). Upon redemption, however, a fifth was added to the estimated value.

(4) By the *price of a dog*, Deut. xxiii. 18 (which was not to be brought into the sanctuary), the connection undoubtedly requires us to understand the pay obtained by unnatural practices, by the קְדֵשִׁים, ver. 17 (such vows occurring in heathendom).

(5) The passages cited are usually so interpreted as to make a vow of no force till *uttered by the lips*. Certainly, till this was the case, it could not come under legal control. In other respects, however, we are not justified in thus pressing the expression; and the view that a vow, *e.g.* like Hannah's, 1 Sam. i. 13, was not binding, would be quite opposed to the moral spirit of Mosaism.

(6) To these simple enactments of the law, the Mishna has added, in the treatise *Nedarim*, abundant casuistry, especially with respect to the forms in which the vow might be pronounced, and the degree in which the different forms were binding. See the article quoted, p. 789, where also the New Testament passages, Matt. xv. 5, Mark vii. 11, are considered. On the notorious *Kol Nidre*, see the article in Herzog.

§ 135.

Nazaritism (1).

The most important vow, ἡ μεγάλη εὐχή, as Philo calls it (*de ebriet.* § 1), was that of Nazaritism. The name נָזִיר from נזר, to separate (2), denotes this vow as one of abstinence (3). The Nazarite, however, is *one who separates himself* with a positive purpose of *consecration to Jehovah* (לְהַזִּיר לַיהוָה, Num. vi. 2, comp. ver. 5). The *law of Nazaritism*, Num. vi. 1–21, treats only of a *temporary* and evidently a *voluntary* assumption of this vow, and not of a *perpetual* Nazaritism like that of Samson, Samuel, and John the Baptist, imposed on them from birth (4). It directs that the Nazarite (or Nazaritess) shall, during the time of his consecration, *in the first place*, renounce the use of *wine* and every other intoxicating drink, also of vinegar prepared from such drinks, and all solutions of grape juice, and even of all that proceeds from the vine, down to the kernels and husks; *secondly*, that he shall let his *hair* grow, so that no razor shall come upon his head; and *thirdly*, that he shall not make himself unclean by approaching a dead body, not even that of his father, mother, brother, or sister. For the rest, he was not commanded to withdraw from intercourse with his fellow-men, nor does the law of the Nazarite speak of an obligation to celibacy; for which reason the Roman Catholic view, which sees in Nazaritism a type of monachism, is irrelevant. The *usual* and at the same time *shortest duration* of this vow of Nazaritism amounted, according to subsequent enactment (*Mishna Nasir*, i. 3, comp. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 15. 1), to thirty days. Of these three prohibitions, the two first appear, Judg. xiii. 4 sq., as binding on the perpetual Nazarite; in 1 Sam. i. 11 only the second, in Luke i. 15 only the first is mentioned. If a Nazarite, during the period of his consecration, became unclean by means of death unexpectedly occurring near him, he was, according to Num. vi. 9, to shave his head on the appointed day of his purification, viz. the seventh, comp. xix. 11 sq. Then on the eighth day he was to bring two turtles or two young pigeons, one for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt-offering, for the priest to make an atonement for him. After this he was

to hallow his head afresh, and without reckoning the former days, to begin a new period of consecration, by bringing a lamb of the first year for a trespass-offering. When the period of his vow had expired, the Nazarite was to offer a threefold sacrifice, viz. a male lamb of the first year for a burnt-offering, an ewe-lamb of the first year for a sin-offering, and a ram for a peace-offering; to these was to be added a basket of unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, and wafers anointed with oil, together with a meat and a drink-offering. His hair was then shorn at the door of the sanctuary and cast into the fire of the peace-offering. Finally, the priest took the sodden shoulder of the ram, together with a cake and a wafer from the basket, put them upon the hands of the Nazarite, and waved them as a wave-offering before the Lord. These portions were allotted to the priest besides the wave-breast and heave-shoulder, which, as in all peace-offerings, were his due.

Nazaritism (an acquaintance with which is presupposed in Num. vi.) may perhaps rest upon some old national customs, but this cannot be definitely asserted. Its derivation by Spencer (*De leg. hebr.* iii. 6. 1), J. D. Michaelis (*Entwurf der typischen Gottesgelahrtheit*, 2d ed. p. 52), and others from Egypt, is founded on the myth of Osiris (Diodor. Sic. i. 18) (5), as is also the notice i. 83, according to which the Egyptians were accustomed to take upon themselves a similar vow during the maladies of their children. The custom, however, was not specifically Egyptian, the votive offering of the hair being found among other ancient nations, especially before the undertaking of a dangerous journey (6). Whatever may have been the origin of Nazaritism, its *signification* can only be ascertained from the Old Testament itself. Thus much is certain from Num. vi., that Nazaritism contemplated *a consecration of the whole being*. Of what character, then, was this consecration? According to Vilmar, the first and second requirements, the avoiding of wine—the culture of the vine being a symbol of civilization—and the omission of cutting the hair, denote the separation of the Nazarite from that profane civilization which endangers man's original relation to Jehovah. It is, however, far more likely, as Philo (comp. *de vict.* § 13) and Maimonides (*More Nebochim*, iii. 48) have already inferred, that they point to *the relation between the Nazarite vow and the commands imposed upon the priesthood*. The first requirement corresponds with the prohibition (Lev. x. 9 sq.) of the use of wine to priests during the time of their administration, the third coincides exactly with the injunction to the high priest (Lev. xxi. 11) not to defile himself with the corpse of even his nearest relative. *The idea of the priestly life*, with its purity and remoteness from everything affected by death or corruption, its self-dedication to God, which sets aside even the nearest earthly ties, is the fundamental idea of Nazaritism. It is true that Nazaritism, as such, involved no special service of the sanctuary: the destination of her hoped-for son to such service by Samuel's mother was in addition to the Nazarite vow (7). Nazaritism, as already said, involved no priestly *service*, but only a voluntary appropriation of the idea of the priestly *mode of life*, —of what was imposed upon the priest in virtue of his hereditary vocation, viz. to regard himself as vowed to God, and consequently to renounce all that was opposed to this self-surrender. It must be granted that a special delight in prayer, and particularly in intercession, might arise, as Ewald conjectures (see *Hist. of the People of Israel*, ii. p. 563), among persons thus vowed to God, from their deep and energetic belief that they were the Lord's special possession; but

we cannot, with Schröring, appeal in support of this notion to Samuel, whose spirit of prayer is connected rather with his position and endowments as a prophet than with his perpetual Nazaritism. We next proceed to inquire into the meaning of the second requirement, viz. that of *letting the hair grow*. According to Num. vi., his hair formed the Nazarite's ornament of consecration, being, vers. 7, 9, the נֵזֶר of his God upon his head, and thus bearing the same name as the high priest's diadem, Ex. xxix. 6, and the anointing oil upon his head, Lev. xxi. 10. The consecration of the Nazarite culminating in the free growth of the hair (hence the expression קֹדֶשׁ אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ, Num. vi. 11, comp. ver. 9), it is in this particular that we should expect to find the fullest impression of the import of Nazaritism. It does not accord with such an expectation to say, that the cutting of the hair being required by decorum, the letting it grow has only the negative meaning of professing to renounce the world and avoid all appearance of vanity and self-pleasing (8). Lev. xxv. 5, 11, where *the vines*, which grew unpruned and were not to be gathered during the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee, are called Nazarites, affords a clue to its true meaning. The consecration of the vine was effected by allowing its whole productive powers free scope to develop and by withdrawing its products from profane use. In like manner was the hair of the Nazarite a symbol of *strength and vitality;* and the circumstance of its remaining inviolate during the whole period of his consecration, denoted that the person of the Nazarite was God's possession, and his strength dedicated to His service, while its growth formed a sacred ornament, like the diadem by which the high priest was recognized as consecrated to God. Thus the command to let the hair grow forms the positive side to the command to avoid all contact with a dead body (comp. Bähr, *Symbolik*, 1st ed. ii. p. 433). Even the heathen offerings of the hair arose from the notion that the hair is the symbol of vital power (the hair of the beard being the token of manhood) (9). In the case of Samson, the hair was not merely the symbol but also the vehicle of that abundance of strength by which he was fitted to become the deliverer of his fellow-countrymen (10). On the ceremony by which the Nazarite was released from his vow of consecration, we need only remark that of the three sacrifices enjoined, viz. the burnt-offering, which formed the foundation of the whole sacrificial act, the sin-offering, appointed for the atonement of any slight transgressions which might have occurred, and the peace-offering, the last was naturally the chief, as is manifest even by its requirement of an animal of higher grade. Two circumstances were peculiar to this offering,—first, that the Nazarite had to cast his shorn-off hair into the sacrificial fire, for, according to the meaning of the law, this and not the fire for boiling is certainly intended; and, secondly, that another portion of the sacrifice besides what was usual was to be waved. By the first act the Nazarite's ornament of consecration was withdrawn from all profanation, and surrendered as it were to Him in whose honor it had been worn, this being, as in the case of those portions of the sacrifice which might not be eaten, effected by its consumption in the sacrificial flame. By the second, it was intimated that the fellowship at table with the Lord which was involved in the peace-offering, took place on this occasion in an enhanced degree. From the significance of Nazaritism, as thus explained, it is easy to perceive why the raising up of Nazarites as well as prophets should be regarded, Amos ii. 11, as a special manifestation of Divine favor (11).

(1) Comp. my article *Nazaritism* in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* x. p. 205 sq., and Ed. Vilmar's subsequent treatise, "Die symbolische Bedeutung des Naziräergelübdes," *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1864, p. 438 sq. [also Riehm's art. in his *Handwörterbuch*].

(2) נזר *Niph.* to separate from, to refrain from; *Hiph.* to separate out of, to withdraw, is akin to נדר, to vow, because a vowed gift is separated.

(3) As the Rabbins also explain נְזִירוּת by פְּרִישָׁה; see the passages in Carpzov, *App. ant. s. cod.* p. 151 sq. The explanation of the name, still retained by Saalschütz (*Mos. Recht*, p. 158), "the crowned," viz. with thick hair, is incorrect; the other meaning also "illustrious," under which נָזִיר occurs, Gen. xlix. 26, Deut. xxxiii. 16, Lam. iv. 7, is only so far connected with נֵזֶר, crown, as both significations arise from the farther notion of distinction which is combined with the primary import of נזר.

(4) Perpetual Nazarites were called נְזִירֵי עוֹלָם; others, on the contrary, נְזִירֵי יָמִים or נְזִירֵי זְמַן קָצוּב. It is worthy of remark that the mother of Samson was, according to Judg. xiii. 4, to refrain from wine and intoxicating drinks, and from unclean meats, during the period of pregnancy, and that the consecration of John the Baptist began also from his mother's womb (Luke i. 15).

(5) On his journey to Ethiopia, Osiris vowed to let his hair grow till his return to Egypt.

(6) Compare *e.g.* the vow of Achilles in the *Iliad*, xxiii. 141 sq. On the other hand, Vatke's objection against the Egyptian origin of Nazaritism, viz. that the prohibition of wine must first have originated in Canaan as a land of vines, is quite untenable, the scriptural statements which ascribe the cultivation of the vine to ancient Egypt being fully corroborated by ancient monuments. (See Hengstenberg, *The Books of Moses and Egypt.*)

(7) It cannot be shown that the women who served the sanctuary (Ex. xxxviii. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 22, comp. § 134) were Nazarites.

(8) Comp. Hengstenberg, *id.* p. 203, and Baur, *zu Am.* ii. 11. A similar view is that of R. Bechai (see Carpzov, *App.* p. 153), who regards the long hair of the Nazarite as a token of mourning (so also J. D. Michaelis, *id.* 127), and of Vilmar cited above. The cutting off the hair of the cleansed leper, in consequence of which he was restored to intercourse with other men, cannot be brought forward in illustration of Num. vi. 18.

(9) On the offering up of the hair, *e.g.* by Athenian youths, see Plutarch, *Thes.* cap. 5; comp. the Troezene custom, Lucian, *de Dea Syria*, cap. 60.

(10) The sevenfold number of the locks of hair, Judg. xvi. 13, represents the hair of one vowed to God as a token of a covenant, as in the wider sense it really was. The very example of Samson shows, however, that this symbol is not to be regarded exclusively (as by Bähr, *id.* p. 432) in an ethical sense as indicating holiness (the bloom of life consecrated to God), though the ethical meaning of the entire surrender of vital energy to the service of God is directly connected with it. Baumgarten (*Kommentar zu Num.* vi. and *History* of the Apostles, ii. 1, p. 307) has brought forward another meaning. Comparing 1 Cor. xi. 3–16 he finds in long hair a token of subjection and subordination, which notion offers no natural explanation of the above facts. Vitringa, on the other hand (*Observ. sacr.* ed. 1723, i. p. 70), referring to Deut. xxxii. 42, Ps. lxviii. 22, views the long hair of tyrants as the *symbolum libertatis et naturæ indomitæ*, and then giving a spiritual turn to the figure regards Nazaritism as the *symbolum status perfectæ libertatis filiorum Dei* (comp. his treatise, *typus Simsonis mystice expositus*, in the 6th Book of the *Observ. sacr.* p. 507 sq.). On the signification of the act of sacrifice which was to take place in case of an infringement of the conditions of Nazaritism, see §137.

(11) In our description of the period of the judges, we shall return once more to the subject of Nazaritism. In the later books of the Old Testament, Nazaritism is never mentioned, though the *Rechabites*, who, according to Jer. xxxv. 8, also avoided the use of wine, may be regarded as a cognate phenomenon. The legality of the post-Babylonian age led also to a revival of Nazaritism. See on this subject, and on those passages in Acts which are said to refer to a Nazarite vow

on the part of St. Paul, and on certain modern decisions respecting it, the above-cited article, p. 209 sq.

APPENDIX: THE THEOCRATIC TAXES.

§ 136.

The fundamental idea of the theocratic taxes was that the people and all their possessions, especially the Holy Land, belonged to the Lord. The acknowledgment of this Divine title was to be made on the part of the people by the surrender to Jehovah of a portion of its produce, as a substitute for, and consecration of, the whole.

1. Hence *the (male) first-born, both of man and beast*, were to be offered; the former were, however, to be redeemed (Ex. xiii. 13; Num. xviii. 15 sq.; see § 105). Of unclean animals, the first-born were to be redeemed at the valuation of the priest, with the addition of a fifth of the worth, xviii. 15, ~~No. xxviii. 26~~ Lev 27:2 sq.; while of clean animals, on the contrary, the first-born, if without blemish, were to be sacrificed within a year from the eighth day after birth. Of this sacrifice, as of the peace-offering, the breast and right shoulder was allotted to the priest; the rest was used for a sacrificial repast (Num. xviii. 17 sq.; Deut. xii. 17 sq.; xv. 19 sq.) (1). If the animal, however, had any blemish, the owner was to eat it at home (Deut. xv. 21 sq.).

2. The *first-fruits of all the produce of agriculture* (Ex. xxiii. 19; Num. xviii. 9 12 sq.; Deut. xxvi. 2 sq.), and, according to Deut. xviii. 4, of the fleece of the sheep, were also to be offered, the quantity being in the latter case left to the liberality of the offerer. The offering of the sheaf of first-ripe corn at the Passover, and of the loaves of first-fruits at Pentecost, by which gratitude for the newly bestowed harvest was expressed, and the food of the new year hallowed, referred to the whole nation. Food in general, which had not been sanctified by the offering up of first-fruits, was unclean food for an Israelite (Hos. ix. 3) (2). How the Israelite was to praise God at this offering for having redeemed His people from Egypt, and given them possession of the Holy Land, may be seen especially in the beautiful ritual prescribed, Deut. xxvi. 1 sq., for the offering of the first-fruits.

3. As the first-fruits represent the blessing to be received, *the tenth* was, properly speaking, the *fee* which the Israelite had to render to Jehovah, as Lord of the soil, for the produce of the land. This tenth of the fruits, whether of field or tree, Lev. xxvii. 30–33, was assigned to the Levites, Num. ~~xvii.~~ 21–24, as a compensation for their deprivation of an inheritance among the tribes. Of this tenth the Levites were to pay a tenth, מְעַשֵּׂר מִן־הַמַּעֲשֵׂר (ver. 26), to the priests. It is only this tenth of the middle books of the Pentateuch which is to be strictly regarded in the light of a tax. The Deuteronomic tenth is of a another character; for Deut. xiv. 22–27, comp. xii. 6 sq., enjoins that the tenth of corn, wine, and oil, shall be brought either in kind, or if the distance be too far, in money, to the sanctuary, and there used for a feast of rejoicing. Every third year, however, the tenth was to be left at home, and a great feast of tithes made, to which the Levites, strangers, widows, and orphans of the place were to be invited. It is this tenth of the third year that is referred to in Amos iv. 4 (3). That the tithe of the middle books and

that of Deuteronomy existed *contemporaneously*, cannot be denied in the presence of Jewish tradition given in LXX of Deut. xxvi. 12 ; Tobit i. 7 sq. ; Josephus, *Antiq.* iv. 8. § 8 and 22 (4). This latter tithe was, as above remarked, no tax in the proper sense of the word, but, by the necessity it involved of laying by a certain portion of the income, was a means of meeting the expense of the pilgrimages to the sanctuary, and of promoting the exercise of benevolence (5). That the rendering of these tithes had also the significance of a *sacrifice of prayer*, is shown by the prayer which, according to Deut. xxvi. 13 sq., was to be uttered after the tithing in the third year (6).

4. The tax imposed for the *service of the sanctuary* (already mentioned, § 92, Ex. xxx. 12 sq., according to which every Israelite when numbered (lest a plague should fall upon the people at their numbering) was to furnish half a shekel (after the shekel of the sanctuary, and therefore of full weight) as a כֹּפֶר, the poor as well as the rich, shows that we have here to deal not with a property-tax, but a personal atonement, or more strictly a covering. (Hence this tribute falls rather under the category of the sin-offering.) The money thus raised was, according to Ex. xxxviii. 25 sq., applied to the building of the sanctuary. This passage seems to represent it as paid but once, though the idea on which this law was founded was one which might at all times find its application ; still it was by no means an annual impost. No mention is subsequently made of it till the restoration of the temple is spoken of after the fall of Athaliah, 2 Chron. xxiv. 6–11 (comp. 2 Kings xii. 5, and Keil *in loco*). In Neh. x. 33 we first meet with a yearly contribution of a third of a shekel for the service of the sanctuary, and that without reference to the Mosaic enactment. In the times of Christ the half shekel reappears (Matt. xvii. 24) as the general Jewish temple-tax.

(1) On the relation of the passages in Deuteronomy [in which the *offerer* is required to eat the firstlings at the sanctuary] to those in Numbers [in which it is enacted that the flesh shall belong to the *priests*, like the wave bread and the shoulder], see the article *Priesterthums* in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* and what is said by Riehm (*Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 42 sq.) in opposing Hengstenberg (*Genuineness*, ii. p. 333 sq.)

(2) Hos. ix. 3 regards the food of the people in captivity as unclean, because those offerings by which it would have been sanctified could not be made in a heathen land.

(3) In Amos iv. 4, the prophet, reproving the hypocritical piety of Israel, says : "Bring your tithes every third day."

(4) The last-named passages reckon three tithes, the tithe of Deuteronomy being regarded as the second. That the command in Deuteronomy places this feast of tithes, which was to be held every third year, *in the place* of the yearly tithe, as Riehm (*Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 45 sq.) supposes, is a groundless hypothesis. It could hardly be conceived that the lawgiver, by insuring to the Levites an opportunity of satisfying their appetite once in three years, could have thought he had thus alleviated their necessitous condition "as far as was possible."

(5) [The manner in which the new criticism employs the regulations respecting the income of the ecclesiastical order, for the support of its view of the development of the history of Israel, may be seen in Wellhausen, i. p. 156 sqq. He would have it that the priests who originally, and even in Deuteronomy, were restricted to only a part of the offerings, continually rose in their demands, until at last the taxes reached an incredible amount ; that the law in Num. xviii. 15 sqq., that all firstlings, of man and beast belonged to the priests, is intelligible only as the last

phase of this process, partly because the tax in comparison with the offering is something derived, and partly because this law presupposes a development of priestly power; while in the most unheard-of manner, a novel requirement of later origin is found in Lev. xxvii. 32, that the priests should have along with the first-born, the tenth part also of the herd and the flock, although in the nature of the case the tithe pertains only to objects which admit of settled measurement (as corn, wine, and oil), and in this form is required in Num. xviii. 21 sqq. In answer to this, see Dillmann, p. 637 sqq., and Bredenkamp, p. 196 sqq. Dillmann finds that the cattle tithe in Leviticus must be very ancient, and that it appears all the more natural, the nearer it comes to the old shepherd life of the tribes, and that the tenth vowed by Jacob, Gen. xxviii, 22 must be understood of a tenth of the herd, since herds were his chief possessions. In respect to the relation of the tithes in the middle books of the Pentateuch and in Deuteronomy, Dillmann agrees with Wellhausen so far as this, viz. that originally the one was introduced *in place of* the other, and that both together were not required till a later period; but Dillmann regards those in the middle books of the Pentateuch as having the priority. On the other hand, Bredenkamp defends the view taken in the text, that the Deuteronomic tithe was required *along with* the other, on the ground which he emphasizes, that the Deuteronomic tithe alone was not sufficient for the support of the ecclesiastical order, and that therefore it might be added to that of the middle books, but could not have been the only provision for the Levites, or have been substituted for that in the middle books of the Pentateuch. Wellhausen's position in regard to the immense amount of priestly dues is connected with the fact that he denies the historical existence of the ecclesiastical tribe of Levi, and in place of it substitutes an order of Levites, who were originally few in number (comp. § 92, note 2). What was provided for the support of a whole tribe, which had no inheritance in Israel, was obviously not too much. That the tax in comparison with the offerings was something derived, may be correct, but it is no argument against the Mosaic origin of the law of tithes. Moreover, the origin of such a law from the authority of Moses is quite as intelligible as from the assumed development of priestly power.]

(6) Deut. xxvi. 13: "I have brought away the hallowed things out of mine house, and also have given them unto the Levite, and unto the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the widow. . . ; ver. 15: Look down then from Thy holy habitation, from heaven, and bless Thy people Israel, and the land which Thou hast given us, as Thou swarest unto our fathers, a land that floweth with milk and honey."

(*c*) THE ATONING SACRIFICE.

§ 137.

1. *The Difference between the Trespass-offering and the Sin-offering with Respect to the End in View.*

The third and fourth kinds of sacrifice, the sin-offering (חַטָּאת) and the trespass-offering (אָשָׁם), have *the common end of abolishing an interruption of the covenant relation caused by some transgression.* This transgression is indeed designated in both cases, with the exception of certain cases in the trespass-offering, as one committed in *error*, בִּשְׁגָגָה, *i.e.* in ignorance (see with respect to the sin-offering, Lev. iv. 2, 13, 22, 27; Num. xv. 27 sq.; to the trespass-offering, Lev. v. 15, 18). Undoubtedly this expression generally refers to *unintentional* offences (comp. in elucidation, Lev. iv. 13, v. 2 sq., 17, where וְלֹא יָדַע, "and he knew it not," relates not to ignorance of the command, but to unconsciousness and unpremeditatedness in the offence; see also how the בִּשְׁגָגָה of Num. xxxv. 11 is explained in Deut. iv. 42 by

בִּבְלִי־דַעַת). Still the expression includes more than mere inadvertence, and extends to errors of *infirmity*, of *rashness*, we might say of *levity*. Its opposite is the sin בְּיָד רָמָה, "with an uplifted hand," *i.e.* rebelliously, Num. xv. 30, the sin committed defiantly, deliberately, the wilful transgression of the Divine commandments. For the latter there is from the legal standpoint no sacrifice, but "that soul shall be cut off from his people."

What then is the distinction as to intention between the trespass and the sin offerings? This difficult question has been variously answered, but none of the answers hitherto given have been thoroughly applicable. It has been said, *e.g.*, that the sin-offering related to sins of commission, the trespass-offering to sins of omission; or that the sin-offering served to avert punishment, the trespass-offering to appease the conscience; or that the sin-offering concerned those sins which had come to the knowledge of others, the trespass-offering such as the transgressor was himself conscious of, without being convicted by others (2). An advance toward the solution of this question has been made chiefly by the treatises of Riehm ("Über das Schuldopfer," *Studien u. Krit.* 1854, i. p. 93 sq.) and Rinck ("Über das Schuldopfer," *id.* 1855, ii. p. 369 sq.), who were preceded by Kurtz, though his view had not exactly met the difficulty. This solution is facilitated when it is noticed that the passage Lev. v. 1–13, which many modern writers (*e.g.* Bähr and Hofmann) still refer to the trespass-offering, treats, on the contrary, of the sin-offering [so *e.g.* Keil, Knobel, Dillmann], as the introductory formula (which is wanting ver. 1), "And the Lord spake unto Moses," ver. 14, shows that a new section begins here, and that 1–13 does not belong to what follows. The appearance of a reference to the trespass-offering in 1–13 disappears when it is perceived that the expressions אָשַׁם (to trespass) and אָשָׁם (trespass) must in this section be taken in their more general sense, in which also a trespass may be spoken of in the case of the sin-offering. On the other hand, it is clear, from vers. 6, 7 (where the juxtaposition of לְחַטָּאת and לְעֹלָה should be observed), 9, and 11 sq., that the חַטָּאת, the sin-offering, is spoken of, as is shown by the selection of sacrificial animals, ver. 6, and by the substitution of doves, ver. 7 sq., which was only allowed in the sin-offering, comp. xiv. 21 sq.—We now proceed to the three passages on the *trespass-offering* in which its import most clearly appears, viz. Lev. v. 14–16, to which belong also vers. 17–19, Lev. vi. 1–6, and Num. v. 5–10. The *first* of these laws enacts that whoever has בִּשְׁגָגָה defrauded in holy things, *i.e.* things pertaining to the priestly revenues, shall bring a ram, according to the estimation of the priest, to the Lord, and at the same time make amends for his fraud by the addition of a fifth. A *more general* application to similar cases (for which the formula which had been used, iv. 27, of the sin-offering is chosen) (3) is then given to this *special* law, as Riehm rightly suggests (*id.* p. 99 sq.), by the addition, vers. 17–19, which has offered much difficulty from its similarity to iv. 27. The *second* commands that whoever has committed any breach of trust, has defrauded or in any way taken advantage of his neighbor, or appropriated that which he found, and also denied such injury by oath, shall make amends by restoration, with the addition of a fifth, and shall also bring a ram, according to priestly estimation, for a trespass-offering. The cases in this category do not, as Riehm justly asserts (*idem*, p. 103 sq.), fall

under the point of view of the שְׁגָגָה, as many have insisted, nor is the expression used here; their mild treatment is explained by the remark in the appendix to § 113. The *third* passage expresses more briefly the command of the second, emphatically insists on confession, and finally enacts, also, that if the individual against whom the trespass was committed has no Goel, the compensation money shall, together with the ram to be offered, devolve to the Lord, *i.e.* be paid to the priest.

What is *common to all three passages*, then, is as follows:—The trespass-offering presupposes a מַעַל, *i.e. an act of defrauding*, which, though *chiefly an infraction of a neighbor's rights in the matter of property*, is also, according to the views of Mosaism, an *infraction of God's rights* in respect to law. Hence, besides material reparation, increased by a fifth of the value, for the offence which is called in Num. v. 7 הֵשִׁיב אֶת-אַשְׁמוֹ, the transgressor had also to make satisfaction to God by means of the trespass-offering. That satisfaction on the part of man is the essential element in the notion of the אָשָׁם, is shown especially by 1 Sam. vi. 3 sq. (4). From this point of view the other cases, in which a trespass-offering was to be brought, are to be explained, *e.g.* the law Lev. xix. 20–22, unchastity with the slave of another being an infraction of the right of property (5). The trespass-offerings, too, which were prescribed for the cleansing of the *leper*, Lev. xiv. 11 sq., and the *Nazarite* whose vow had been broken, Num. vi. 12, may be understood from the point of view described. It is evident that in both cases the trespass-offering effects a *restitutio in integrum*, a restoration to the privileges of the theocratic citizen. But how, we may ask, is this effected? According to Riehm, who seems to have the right idea, the trespass-offering is here also to be regarded as a kind of *mulcta*, a restitutionary payment for an infraction of law. The leper, so long as he was excluded from the congregation, did not offer to God the reverence that was due to Him,—he, as it were, diminished it. The Nazarite, by the intermission of his vow, deprived God of the time dedicated to Him, and delayed for so much longer the payment of his vow (6). Keil, on the other hand, after Rinck's example (*idem*, p. 374), regards the trespass-offerings of the leper and the Nazarite in the light of a *compensation* for *restoration* to the former state of consecration, thus giving them also the significance of a sacrifice of prayer (an extension of the trespass-offering of which there is no other example) (7).—Satisfaction being thus rendered in the trespass-offering for a committed מַעַל, it served indeed at the same time as a *covering or atonement* (כִּפֶּר) for him who had committed the מַעַל (Lev. v. 18), so that, covered by this satisfaction, he might approach the holy God. But to effect *directly* an atonement for a sinner's *soul* (by the offering of a pure life), and therefore the *absolution from sin of the sinner's person*, was the office not of the trespass but of the *sin offering* (8). This was offered for all sins committed בִּשְׁגָגָה, and indeed not merely for separate offences, but for all sins unknown and unatoned for during a certain period. The reason that sin-offerings were combined with illustrations for uncleanness, is found in the fact that sexual conditions, the disease of leprosy, and death, were regarded in their connection with the natural sinfulness of man (comp. § 77). Now every sin involves also an אָשָׁם, a debt (comp. Lev. iv. 3, 13, 22, etc.); but every debt is not a defrauding in the stricter sense, an infringement, properly speaking,

of the Divine rights, though it must certainly be conceded that the limits cannot always be clearly defined. Where such a מָעַל does not take place, the expiation of the person effected by the sin-offering annuls also the אָשָׁם without any farther offering. From what has been said, it is also easy to understand why the trespass-offerings always refer to certain concrete cases, and never, like the sin-offerings, to the offences in general committed during whole periods, and do not appear, like other kinds of offerings, on festal occasions (comp. Num. vii. 28 sq.).

(1) [Comp. Delitzsch's art. "Schuldopfer" in Riehm.—That the sin-offering is of later origin than the burnt-offering and the peace-offering is admitted. For the peace-offering appears in the form of the sacrificial meal in the age of the patriarchs, and the burnt-offering in the history of Noah (comp. § 121, and Dillmann, p. 379 sq.). The new criticism, however, represents that the sin-offering originated far later than the time of Moses. Wellhausen (i. 76) finds the sin- and trespass-offering first in Ezekiel, and thinks therefore that these offerings originated not long before that prophet, in the 7th century, as a substitute for fines previously customary—an origin which may be traced in the Pentateuch, since they are not gifts to God, but penalties to be paid to the priests. Dillmann's judgment, on the other hand, is (p. 381): "The earnestness of the striving after holiness, and the keen sensitiveness in respect to sin and guilt which Mosaism sought to produce, and did actually more and more produce, rendered it necessary to furnish the means of absolution and purification;" and Delitzsch ("The Law of Leprosy in Leviticus," in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, 1880) shows that the sin- and trespass-offerings were among the rites in the purification of lepers, after having previously exhibited the evidence that the law of leprosy "sustains the historical character of the Mosaic legislation in the most satisfactory manner." That Ezekiel in any case presupposes the sin- and trespass-offerings as well known (comp. the first mentioned of them in his prophecy, xl. 39), will not be denied (comp. besides Delitzsch, p. 8, especially Kittel, *Stud. a. W.* 1881, p. 60, sqq.). On more or less certain traces of the sin-offering before the exile, see Delitzsch, p. 8, sqq; Dillmann, p. 413; Bredenkamp, p. 198, comp. with 59 sq., and the variously explained passages, 2 K. xii. 17; Hos. iv. 8 (acc. to Delitzsch, who agrees with Keil, "They eat up the sin-offering of my people, and thereupon, that they may be themselves guiltless, they direct each one his desire," a rendering which Bredenkamp does not accept); Micah vi. 7; Jer. xxii. 1 (perhaps an allusion to the sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering upon the horns of the altar); Ps. xl. 7.]

(2) This, which was formerly the most widely accepted view, is alluded to by Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 9. 3, and among modern writers has been especially defended by Winer (*Reallex.* ii. 3d edit. p. 432 sq.). This distinction receives no adequate support from Lev. iv. 23, 28, where הוֹדַע does not necessarily imply an objective conviction (comp. יָדַע, v. 3 sq.); it also leaves several cases of the trespass-offering unexplained, as that of the leper and the Nazarite, and that prescribed xix. 20 sqq.; comp. also Ezra x. 9, where a public conviction took place. Ewald's view, that the trespass-offering was the penitential offering of "one who felt himself excluded from the congregation by some transgression which depressed him, or by some secret Divine infliction," and that the sin-offering was presented when the fault was first remarked by others, is akin to this (*Antiquities* p. 57 sq.). See the enumeration of other views in Knobel on Lev. v. 14 sq.

(3) [Dillmann refers this passage to the case in which one feels burdened with a certain sense of guilt on account of an unintentional violation of a divine command, though without being able to name it. In this case he must bring a trespass-offering, because the transgression consisted possibly in an embezzlement. But according to the conclusion reached at the end of the text in this section, a sin-offering would be more natural for an indistinct feeling of guilt, and hence we should be justified in borrowing the more definite meaning of the indefinite ex-

pression from its connection with the preceding verses, and referring the passage to the מַעַל unwittingly committed.]

(4) In 1 Sam. vi. 3 sq., the expression הָשִׁיב אָשָׁם is used of the gifts which the Philistines offer as an expiation for their detention of the ark.

(5) According to Lev. xix. 20–22, any who should lie with the bondmaid of another, besides undergoing a civil penalty (בִּקֹּרֶת, probably corporal punishment), was also to offer a ram, of which, moreover, no estimation was prescribed, to Jehovah as an atonement for his fault. The omission of the estimation may be explained by the consideration that there was here, generally speaking, no מַעַל that could be estimated by money. Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 260) takes quite a different view of the passage.

(6) Comp. Riehm, *idem*, p. 101 sq. Keil (*Archäol.* i. p. 221) objects that the leper was not guilty of this exclusion from the public worship of God, and likewise that the Nazarite who, during the period of his consecration, had unwittingly contracted ceremonial uncleanness, had violated no right. But he here fails to observe the significance of leprosy and uncleanness in the eye of the law. If both involved the necessity of a sin-offering, the infraction thereby committed upon the sphere of Divine rights might also be regarded as a matter for which compensation should be made.—[Dillmann thinks that this trespass-offering also must be explained on the presumption that some obscure guilt, not distinctly known, had occasioned the misfortune of the persons in question.]

(7) With respect, finally, to the trespass-offering, which, at Ezra's requirement (Ezra x. 18 sq.), those were to bring who had married strange wives, we find that here also a מַעַל was in question (comp. vers. 2 and 10): the desecration of the covenant people by heathen blood (comp. ix. 2) was an act of injustice and fraud toward the covenant God which demanded compensation.

(8) [Delitzsch: "The fundamental idea of the sin-offering is *expiatio*, that of the trespass-offering, *satisfactio:* in the former, the evangelical feature is prominent, in the latter, the disciplinary."]

§ 138.

2. *The Ritual and Import of the Trespass and the Sin Offerings: The Trespass-Offering.*

There is a decided difference in the ritual of these two offerings, corresponding to their different intentions. Only the male sheep, generally the full-grown (according to the *Mishna Sebachim*, x. 5, two-year old) ram, the very animal not included among the sin-offering victims, was used for the *trespass-offering;* hence the technical expression אֵיל הָאָשָׁם. In the case alone of the trespass-offerings of the leper and the Nazarite was the less costly animal—the male (according to Num. vi. 12, and LXX, Lev. xiv. 10, one-year old) lamb (כֶּבֶשׂ)—prescribed, undoubtedly to point out the inferior degree of the אָשָׁם. Why the *male* sheep was selected for the trespass-offering cannot be exactly determined. Riehm (*id.* p. 117) thinks that it was because an infraction of law has the character of violence. It was, however, general in ancient times to use rams and other male animals for fines (comp. Knobel and Dillmann on Lev. v. 15). Another essential distinction between the trespass and the sin offering was, that the victims were in the former case always the same, whatever might be the position of the offerer in the theocracy; nor could a substitute be admitted, as in the sin-offering, on account of the poverty of the worshipper. This makes it clear that the chief object of the trespass-offering was not an expiation for the *person* as such, but a

compensation for a strictly defined injury. The circumstance, also, that a certain margin was, in Lev. v. 15, left in the *estimation* of the ram (by the demand of an indefinite number of shekels, two or more), shows that the value of the ram was to bear a certain proportion to the greatness of the מַעַל (1).—The proceedings at the bringing of the trespass-offering are laid down in Lev. vii. 1–7. The laying on of the hand is not specially mentioned in this passage, on which account Rinck (*id.* p. 375 sq.) and Knobel (*in loco*) suppose that it did not take place, which the latter explains by the consideration that it is not a surrender, a free-will offering, but an imposed penance which is here in question. It cannot, however, be proved that the act of laying the hand on the head of the victim expressed a voluntary surrender; and the non-mention of this act in the passage quoted may, as in the corresponding passage on the sin-offering, vi. 17–23, be accidental [so also Dillmann]. The trespass as well as the burnt-offering and the sin-offering was slain at the north side of the altar. There is no kind of hint that its slaughter signified the substitutionary suffering of death by the ram for the transgressor, as even Keil (*Archäologie*, i. p. 237) here supposes; (the most striking case would have been the trespass-offering of the Nazarite). The symbolical equivalent for the trespass was the ram as estimated by the priest. The blood was, as in the burnt-offering and peace-offering, only sprinkled about the altar (2), the same portions of fat as in the peace-offering and sin-offering being burnt upon the altar. The rest of the flesh was treated as in sin-offerings of the lower grade, that is to say, it was to be consumed by the priests (only by males) in the holy place. For it is self-evident that he who was offering it could not himself be allowed any participation of the compensation he was rendering for an offence committed (3).

(1) Comp. Riehm, *id.* p. 119. The words, Lev. v. 15, בְּעֶרְכְּךָ כֶּסֶף שְׁקָלִים, "according to thy estimation, a sum of shekels," are understood by the older authorities of an estimation amounting to *two* shekels.

(2) Thus even in the particular in which especially the peculiarity of the sin-offerings appears, viz. the manipulation of the blood, the trespass-offering stands on a level with the other kinds of sacrifices.

(3) The significance of the several elements of the act of sacrifice has already been discussed. The consumption of the flesh by the priests will be further treated of when we come to the sin-offering.

§ 139.

Continuation: The Ritual of the Sin-Offering (1).

Peculiar to the *sin-offering* are—

1. The *difference of the victims*, according to the theocratic position of him for whom they were sacrificed, and in a certain sense also to the occasion of the offering. The victim was *a young bullock* in sin-offerings of the highest grade, viz. those for the high priest on the Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 3, or when he had transgressed in his office of representative of the people (Lev. iv. 3, "to the offence of the people"), or when the whole congregation had transgressed, iv. 13; or, finally, the sin-offerings pertaining to the consecration of priests and Levites (Ex. xxix. 10, 14, 36; Num. viii. 8). A kid of the goats (עִזִּים שְׂעִיר) was the sin-

offering for the people on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 5), on the other yearly festivals, and at the New Moon (Num. xxviii. 15, 22, 30, xxix. 5, etc.); for the offence of a ruler (נָשִׂיא, Lev. iv. 22 sq.); at the dedication of the tabernacle (ix. 3, 15, comp. Num. vii. 16, etc.); and again for the offences of the congregation (Num. xv. 24), viz. when something had been committed "away from the eyes," *i.e.* behind the back of the congregation (2). A *goat* or a *female* lamb was to be offered for the offence of an ordinary Israelite (Lev. iv. 28, 32, v. 6); a ewe-lamb of the first year was the sin-offering at the release from the Nazarite's vow (Num. vi. 14), and at the purification of the leper (Lev. xiv. 10, 19). *Turtle doves* and *young pigeons* formed the sin-offerings at purifications (Lev. xii. 6, xv. 14, 29; Num. vi. 10), and were the substitutes for a lamb or other small cattle from the poor who were unable to afford the latter (Lev. v. 7, xiv. 22). If any were not able to offer even pigeons, a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, but without oil or frankincense, might be substituted in the case of ordinary offences (v. 11) (3).

2. The *blood* was brought to more sacred places than was the case in other sacrifices, and in the three following degrees: *a.* In sin-offerings of goats, kids, or lambs, for individual Israelites (with the exception of the high priest), some of the blood was smeared on the horns of the altar, and the rest poured out at its base (Lev. iv. 25, 30, 34). The same was done at the sin-offering of a bullock at the consecration of priests, Ex. xxix. 12, and undoubtedly at that of Levites also. *b.* In the sin-offerings of bullocks offered for the congregation or for the high priest on other occasions than the Day of Atonement, the blood was sprinkled seven times toward the inner veil, the horns of the altar of incense were smeared therewith, and the rest was poured out at the base of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. iv. 5 sqq., 16 sqq.). *c.* At the greatest of the sin-offerings, viz. that on the Day of Atonement, the blood was taken into the Holy of Holies (see thereon § 140).

3. The consumption in sin-offerings of the lower grade (except those made at the consecration of priests) of the *flesh of the sacrifice*, which had come into close contact with God, and was therefore designated as *most holy* (Lev. vi. 22, קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, comp. Knobel on Lev. xxi. 22), by the priests in the fore-court of the sanctuary, vi. 18 sq. In sin-offerings of the higher grade, and those made at the consecration of priests, the flesh, together with the skin, head, bones, entrails, and dung, were burned in a clean place outside the camp (Lev. iv. 11 sq., 21, vi. 23, xvi. 27) (4). Whoever had his garment sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering, was to wash it out in the holy place, evidently to guard against a profanation of the sacred blood. The vessels in which the sin-offerings of the lower grade had been boiled were, if of earth, to be broken; if of brass or copper, to be scoured with the greatest care (vi. 28 sq.). In offerings of the higher grade, he who had burnt the flesh without the camp was to bathe, and wash his clothes before his return to the camp (xvi. 28) (5).

The *explanation* of the ritual of the sin-offering must be connected with what has already been said on the nature of sacrificial atonement. To substitute for the impure soul of the sinner a pure soul, which, being offered to God, may cover the offerer, is, as remarked, § 127, the meaning of a bloody offering, and consequently the direct intention of the sin-offering. The representation of the offerer's *person* being the matter in question, the value of the victim corresponds with the difference of his theocratic position. The reason for the predominance of goats

(especially the he-goat) in the sin-offering may be that their flesh was considered less delicate (6) ; for the consumption of the flesh by the priests in some of the sin-offerings is not to be regarded as a formal repast. With this corresponds the omission of the oil in the substitionary flour-offering of the poor. Applying, then, our former propositions, we find that the significance of the several elements of the sin-offering is as follows : The *laying on of the hand*, with which was probably connected the confession of sin, is meant to express the intention of the offerer to sacrifice the pure life of the animal as a covering for his impure soul. The sacrifice itself follows in the blood obtained by the slaughter, and then immediately applied to the holy place, where God is present. And to show that this offering of the blood in the sin-offering is not the presupposition, but the main point of the sacrificial act, the blood is here actually placed upon the *altar* ; nay, to bring it, as it were, as near as possible to God, it is even applied to the horns of the altar (comp. § 119) (7). This bringing near of the blood to God advances in sin-offerings of the higher grade, till it reaches its climax in the great annual Atonement, the blood of which attains the nearest approach, by being brought into the Holy of Holies (8). The offering of the blood is followed by *the burning of the fatty portions* upon the altar, and that, as is distinctly said, Lev. iv. 31, לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה,—an addition which must not be overlooked (9), as showing that the burning of the fat in the sin-offering cannot have an essentially different meaning from that which it bears in the peace-offering (10). God commands that the fat also of the pure victim, whose blood He has accepted as a covering for the soul of the sinner, should be conveyed to Him by means of fire, and this gives it the significance of a propitiatory offering, the acceptance of which serves as a sanction to the preceding act of atonement (11). Only the fat, however, and not the whole animal, was presented on the altar, to give prominence to the idea that in this sacrifice the offering of a *gift* holds a secondary position to the act of expiation. The rest of the flesh, moreover, was not to be used in a manner by which this *sanctissimum* could be in any way profaned. It is self-evident that they by whom the sin-offering was brought could not be permitted any use of it. Hence, in sin-offerings of the higher grade, in which the priests themselves were included among those for whom atonement was made, all that remained to be done was to *destroy* the flesh in a clean manner ; for this is the meaning of the burning, as even the expression chosen, שָׂרַף (in distinction from הִקְטִיר, comp. § 128), shows. But why, it may be asked, was the flesh of sin-offerings of the lower grade, as well as that of the peace-offerings, to be consumed by the priests in their official capacity in the holy place ? The answer is furnished by Lev. x. 17, though not indeed in the sense in which the passage has been usually interpreted. When it is said in this very variously understood passage, that the sin-offering is given to the priests to eat, "to take away the guilt of the congregation, and to atone for them before the Lord,"—the actual taking away of guilt and atonement being the result of the offering of the blood,—the expression must be taken (as by Vatablus) as declaratory. The eating of the flesh by the priests involves, like the burning of the fat, an acceptance on the part of God, which serves to declare and confirm the fact that the sacrifice has actually attained its end of making an atonement. [So also Dillmann.] So far Philo (*de vict.* § 13) really sees correctly, when he points out as one of the reasons for this use of the flesh of the sin-offering,

the quieting of the offerer's mind by the assurance of forgiveness ; for God would not have bidden His servants to partake of such a meal, unless a full oblivion of sin had taken place (12).

Very differently is the ritual of the sin-offering explained, when its essential feature is made to consist in the infliction of a *pœna vicaria*. Not to repeat what has already been said on this point (§ 126 sq.), we will confine ourselves to the following remarks. According to this theory, the animal is said to be, by the laying on of the hand, laden with sin, and thus to have become "incarnate sin" (in the antitype, 2 Cor. v. 21 : God "made Christ to be sin"), the impurity of the sinner being transferred to the victim, and, as it were, imbibed by it. Thus the Rabbins (13), and among the moderns, *e.g.* Hengstenberg (*Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1852, p. 117 sq.). In this case the sprinkling of blood which follows is not the real act of atonement ; on the contrary, its intention is (comp. Hengstenberg, p. 122) the *exhibition* of the atonement effected by the death of the victim, and of its acceptance on the part of God. While, then, Kurtz, *e.g.* as already cited, § 127, views the victim as restored *in integrum* by death,—which makes it explicable why the burnt fat of this sin-offering is a sweet savor to God,—others, on the contrary (14), regard sin as still cleaving to the flesh of the victim, and the act of atonement as completed when the priests eat the sin-offering, and thus having, as it were, incorporated the sin, annul it by their official holiness. This view has been chiefly vindicated by the name of the sin-offering, חַטָּאת (*sin*). This word, however, as well as פֶּשַׁע, which stands in juxtaposition with it, Mic. vi. 7, denotes by an obvious metonomy that which is offered *for* sin. The expression is given more in full, Lev. iv. 3, עַל־חַטָּאת ; and חַטָּאת also, when it stands for the sin-offering, is correctly rendered in the LXX by *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*. The obvious objection, that the body of the victim thus infected with sin is not, like the corpse of an executed malefactor, cast as soon as possible as a קְלֻלַת אֱלֹהִים (Deut. xxi. 23) into an unclean place, may be removed by the remark (15) that there is a distinction between inherent and imputed sin, and that with the latter the victim may nevertheless in another aspect be regarded as most holy, for which twofold significance of the victim the ceremony Num. xix. 7–10, hereafter to be discussed, may with some plausibility be appealed to.

(1) The ordinary sin-offering is here chiefly treated of, and a more circumstantial description of the great act of expiation on the Day of Atonement subsequently given.

(2) The precept Num. xv. 24 is distinguished from that given Lev. iv. 13 sqq., by the circumstance that the latter has regard to the case of a transgression in which the whole congregation shares, the former to a case in which the congregation as such is not the agent, but has to appear for the sin of one of its members, committed probably without its knowledge.

(3) For it had not the character of the Minhha, properly so called, from which it is also distinguished by the כַּמִּנְחָה of Lev. v. 13.

(4) According to Lev. iv. 12, to the place where the ashes of the sacrifice were brought from the place mentioned, i. 16.

(5) When pigeons formed the sin-offering, it cannot be certainly distinguished whether, after removing the crop and entrails and casting them on the ashes, the whole bird was burnt upon the altar, or as stated, *Mishna Sebachim*, vi. 4, the blood only appertained to the altar, the rest to the priest. From the flour-offering

of the poor the priest was to take a handful to burn on the altar, the rest, as in the case of the meat-offering, becoming his own (Lev. v. 12 sq.).

(6) The Rabbinical notions, that the propitiation for the people on the Day of Atonement must necessarily have been a goat, because the patriarchs slew a goat when Joseph was sold, or (as Maimonides supposes) because the Israelites had most grievously transgressed in the worship of the goat (Lev. xvii. 7), and the like, are scarcely worthy of mention. The idea, too, of Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 399), that the goat, on account of its long shaggy hair, is designed to allude to sorrow for sin, must be too artificial.

(5) Keil, by viewing the horns as a symbol of power, understands this otherwise. In his view, the soul is symbolically transferred to the full sway of the power of Divine grace, by the putting of the blood on the horns of the altar.

(6) The *sevenfold sprinkling* which took place in the latter sacrifices, signifies that the entire covenant relationship with God was compromised by sin, and must be re-established by expiation.

(7) In respect to which only an incorrect interpretation of the sin-offering could allow us to say, with Knobel, that it escaped the author by an oversight.

(8) It is true, indeed, that it is not said of the sin-offering, as it is of both the burnt-offering and the peace-offering, that it is *acceptable* to Jehovah (וְנִרְצָה לוֹ, Lev. i. 4, vii. 18, xix. 7, xxii. 19, 23, etc.), for the bringing of a sin-offering is ever a *sad* necessity.

(9) In the other kinds of sacrifices, the preceding expiation by blood forms the *conditio sine qua non* of that which is their main point, namely, the offering of a gift (comp. § 127, conclusion) : in the sin-offering, on the contrary, the subsequent gift serves for a confirmation, and so in a certain sense for a completion, of the expiation, which is the immediate intention of this sacrifice.

(10) A still farther declaration of the forgiveness of sins as added, as in the ritual of the Day of Atonement (see § 140).

(11) See the passages in Outram, *De sacrificiis*, p. 251 sq.

(12) Thus after the precedent of Deyling, *Observ.* i. No. lxv. 2, Hengstenberg, *id.* p. 118, Keil, *id.* p. 232 ; comp. also Ewald's *Antiquities*, p. 75. [This view has recently been defended by Riehm in the dissertation, p. 69 sqq., mentioned in § 127 ; comp. also his article "Bann" in his *Handwörterbuch*. He regards the flesh of the sin-offering as "most holy" in the same sense as what is under the ban is styled most holy, namely, as fallen under the destroying wrath of God. That the sacrificial flesh of many sin-offerings is assigned to the priests as food, would be analogous, in this view, to the fact that in the ban of lower grade God appropriates forever the possession fallen to Him, and to a degree gives it over to His holy servants for their use. Dillmann so far recognizes this view as to admit that in the requirements of the law to which it appeals, remains of an older line of thought gradually vanishing appear (p. 417, comp. 444 sq.).—But though single features of the ritual of sacrifice agree with Riehm's theory, it is still full of contradictions. How can the soul of one and the same sacrificial animal be acceptable to God as pure, and the smoke of the fat be to him a sweet savor, while the remainder is an object of his destroying wrath ?]

(13) See Hengstenberg, *id.* ; comp. Keil, *id.* p. 235.

§ 140.

Continuation : The Ritual of the Day of Atonement (1).

The supreme act of expiation was, as already remarked, that which took place on the tenth day of the seventh month (*Tisri*), the annual *Day of Atonement*, יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים, in the Talmud יוֹמָא, *i.e.* simply the day. Fasting being commanded, on pain of extirpation, from the evening of the ninth till the evening of the tenth (2), it is called in Josephus (*Ant.* xiv. 4. 3) ἡ τῆς νηστείας ἡμέρα, in Philo (*de*

times "before the mercy-seat," *i.e.* upon the ground before the ark (10), leaving, as may be presumed, the vessel containing the blood in the holy place for the next act of sprinkling. Having thus made atonement for himself, he was now capable of making it for the congregation. He therefore returned to the court, slew the goat destined for the Lord, brought its blood also into the Holy of Holies, and performed the same sprinklings as before. This concluded the acts of atonement made in the *Holy of Holies*. Next followed that made in the *Holy place;* for it is this that is signified by אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, ver. 16*b*, comp. with vers. 20, 23, 33, in distinction from קֹדֶשׁ, which here stands for the Holy of Holies. Of this act it is briefly said, "So shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that dwelleth among you." This is to be supplemented by the injunction of Ex. xxx. 10, which commands that an atonement was to be made once a year upon the horns of the altar of incense with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement. Hence it may be assumed that a single application of the blood to the horns of the altar of incense, followed by a sevenfold sprinkling in front of it, corresponding with the process within the Holy of Holies, took place. It is, however, uncertain whether this was done first with the blood of the bullock then with that of the goat, or whether, as tradition (M. Joma, v. 4; Maimonides, iii. 5) states, and as is more probable, the blood of both victims was mingled for the purification of the holy place. It is further remarked (Lev. xvi. 17) that during these acts of atonement by the high priest, no one besides himself might be present in the tabernacle, lest the presence of another should again render the sanctuary unclean. Lastly followed the atonement for the *altar of burnt-offering*, which here, as well as in ver. 12, is called the altar that is before the Lord (11).

The atonement for the priesthood, the congregation, and the sanctuary, according to its three divisions, being thus completed, the other goat (ver. 20, comp. with ver. 10), on which the lot for Azazel fell, was to be brought hither, *i.e.* before the altar of burnt-offering, and presented alive before the Lord, and indeed, as is added in ver. 10, לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו, which controverted words (12) are probably to be explained "to cover him" (the goat), viz. by the application of the blood of the slaughtered goat. The proceedings at the purification of the recovered *leper*, Lev. xiv. 6, and the infected house, ver. 51, elucidate this point. Here two birds were taken: the one was killed; and the other, after being dipped in the blood of the first, was let loose into the open field. As the slain goat represented the people for whom atonement was to be made, so was the living goat (on which see § 141) the instrument of the people, when, an atonement having been made, they had become partakers of Divine forgiveness. "This duality of the goats is caused only (as Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 165, rightly remarks) by the physical impossibility of representing the two elements to be represented by a single example." By the application of the blood of the first goat to the second, it was moreover declared, that only in virtue of the atonement effected by the blood of the first goat are the people placed in a condition to send away their sins as forgiven to Azazel (13). The act of sending away the goat is thus described (Lev. xvi. 21 sq.): "And let Aaron lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat (14, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions according to all their sins, and let him put them upon the head of the goat, and send him away by a man ready at hand into the wilderness.

And let the goat bear upon him all their iniquities into a separated land"(אֶרֶץ גְּזֵרָה), *i.e.* a place whence no road leads back to the dwellings of the people (so there need be no anxiety lest the goat should find his way back to their abodes). Thus were the sins laid upon the goat to be, as it were, banished to a place removed from all contact with the people. That the goat was to perish in the wilderness, and thus to suffer what is due to the sinner, upon whom his sin remains, is by no means hinted in the text. It is true, indeed, that the high priest, according to a subsequent enactment, invoked upon the goat the punishment due to all the transgressions of Israel, and that tradition further declares (M. Joma, vi. 6) that the goat was cast down from a rock and destroyed by the fall. The law, however, would never have been silent concerning so essential a feature. He who had led away the goat for Azazel was (ver. 26) to wash his clothes, and to bathe, and afterward to come into the camp.

After the goat was sent into the wilderness (15), the high priest betook himself to the (ver. 23) tabernacle, took off the linen garments, and deposited them there, then bathed again in the court, put on his usual official garments, and offered the burnt-offerings, consisting of the rams mentioned vers. 3 and 5, for himself and the people (16). Together with the flesh of the burnt-offering was also burned the fat of the previously slain sin-offerings. The flesh of the latter (ver. 27), with their skins and dung, was to be sent forth without the camp, and there burned (comp. § 139). The man who performed this office was, according to ver. 28, to wash his clothes and bathe, and afterward to return to the camp. It was not until all connected with the act of atonement to be performed on this day was completed, that the festival offerings prescribed for the day, Num. xxix. 7, 11, were offered, as tradition distinctly asserts (17).

(1) Compare my article "Versöhnungstag" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xxi. p. 446 sq. The traditional institutions concerning the Day of Atonement are given in the Talmudic treatise *Joma*, the Mishna text of which was first separately edited by Sheringham in the year 1648, with explanations, which are also adopted in the Surenhus edition of the Mishna. The Thosaphta to the treatise *Joma* is printed in Ugolino's *Thes. antiq. sacr.* xviii. p. 153 sq., as is also the Jerusalem Gemara thereto. A translation of the section on the ritual of the Day of Atonement from Maimonides, *Hajad hachazaka*, is given by Delitzsch in his *Commentary to the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ii. p. 464 sqq. Compare also Lightfoot, *ministerium templi*, Kap. 15 (*Opp.* i. p. 744 sqq.); Lund, *Jüdische Heiligthümer*, p. 1027 sqq.; J. G. Carpzov, *Appar. antiq. s. cod.* p. 433 sqq.; J. A. Danz, *functio pontif. M. in adyto anniversaria*, in Meuschen's *Nov. Test. ex Talm. illustr.* p. 912 sqq.; Bähr, *Symbolik des mos. Kultus*, ii. p. 664 sqq.; Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, *in loc.*; Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 168; Keil, *Bibl. Archäol.* i. p. 400 sqq.; Kurtz, *Sacrificial Worship of the O. T.* p. 385 sqq.

(2) Comp. Lev. xvi. 29-31, xxiii. 27-29. This command was the better calculated to produce an appreciation of the serious nature of this solemnity, inasmuch as no other fast was prescribed by the Mosaic law (comp. § 134).

(3) It is, moreover, peculiar to the Mosaic institutions to accumulate acts of atonement, for the express purpose of producing a consciousness of their inadequacy (comp. what is said § 96).

(4) Each individual Israelite might appropriate to himself this atoning grace, so far as he was truly a member of the congregation thus seeking God's grace, and proved himself to be such by professing contrition in the manner prescribed, Lev. xvi. 31, xxiii. 27 sq. No sacrifice, on the other hand, could avail (comp. 1 Sam. iii. 14) for him who, by wilfully cherishing sin, separated himself from the cove-

nant. This is the manner in which the statements of Lev. xvi. 16, 21, 30, may be reconciled with Heb. ix. 7, v. 2. When the Epistle to the Hebrews refers the act of the Day of Atonement merely to the *ἀγνοήματα* of the people, this expression is not meant to exclude all sins consciously committed from the atonement, but to express the contrast to those transgressions in which, as subsequent impenitence testified, a breach of the covenant was intended.

(5) For further particulars see the article in Herzog, p. 456.

(6) The high priest, in fulfilling the expiatory functions committed to him on this day, was not, as Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 148) rightly remarks, to appear before the people in the splendor befitting the delegate of Jehovah, but before the Lord in the simple purity of his God-ordained office. We cannot, however, with Kurtz (*id.* p. 389), see in this injunction a reduction to the garments of the ordinary priests, nor still less, according to the view revived by Knobel *in loco*, a penitential garb. The former notion, according to which the high priest was to officiate on this day not as the chief of the priesthood, but as the priest appointed for the day, is inconsistent with the eminent importance of the act of intercession to be performed, which must be made the very man, whose dignity equalled that of the whole people, and to whom the full power of the whole priesthood was committed (see § 96). To this may be added, that the girdle of the ordinary priests was not entirely white, and that they wore not the כִּיצְנֶפֶת, but the מִגְבָּעָה, on their heads. To the second view Keil justly raises the objection: Where in all the world are garments of dazzling whiteness worn as symbols of mourning or penitence? The High Priest wore the white linen garments on the day he entered the Holy of Holies, the seat of the divine Shekhina, for the same reason that they are attributed to the highest spirits who stand before the throne of God in heaven (Ezek. i. 2, 3, 11; x. 2, 6, 7; Dan. x. 5; xii. 6 sq.). Conversely in the vision in Zech. iii. 3, the high priest Joshua's incapacity to intercede with God for the people is indicated by his filthy garments.

(7) [Baudissen (i. 140 sq.) favors as probable Diestel's attempted explanation of the name as compounded of עֵז and אֵל with the signification "strong god," according to which Azazel would be regarded as a heathen divinity changed into a demon. Against this see Dillmann *s.l.*]

(8) The word *ἀποπομπαῖος*, indeed, signifies not that which is dismissed or sent away, but, like the Latin *averruncus*, he who dismisses, who averts = *ἀλεξίκακος*. We are not exactly justified in regarding Azazel as Hengstenberg does, as simply equivalent to Satan, because the latter does not appear in the Pentateuch; still the idea of Azazel is at all events *akin* to the idea of Satan.

(9) For the *altar of burnt-offering*, upon which, according to Lev. vi. 2–6, fire was burning continually, is intended (see *Joma* iv. 3), and not, as Bähr (*e.g. id.* p. 669) supposes, the altar of incense, on which was no fuel.

(10) This latter sprinkling evidently concerned not the mercy-seat, but the place in which it was, *i.e.* the Holy of Holies. Hence the first and single sprinkling must be referred (as by Kurtz, *idem*, p. 391, and Keil *in loco*) to the personal purification of the High Priest and the priesthood, the second and sevenfold to the purification of the sanctuary, which had been polluted by the sinful atmosphere of the priests. (According to another explanation, the former portion of ver. 14 is to be regarded merely as a more general direction, the particulars of the action being delayed to the second. The Vulgate assumes this view by combining the two sentences into one.)

(11) Keil, Kurtz, and Dillmann justly maintain that the *altar of burnt-offering* is referred to in Lev. xvi. 18, while the ordinary explanation of the passage asserts, on the contrary, that the altar of incense within the sanctuary is intended by "the altar that is before the Lord," and consequently regards ver. 18 as adding supplementary particulars to ver. 16. The objections raised against the former view by Delitzsch and Hofmann are obviated by Kurtz, p. 391 sq. The atonement for the altar of burnt-offering was effected by applying to its horns the blood of the bullock and the goat, and then by sprinkling the blood upon it seven times

with the finger. (The expression עָלָיו forbids us to suppose a sprinkling of the ground before the altar, which, as Kurtz aptly remarks, is explained by the circumstance, that in the court of the tabernacle not the whole space but only the altar is the place of Divine revelation.) The first act again refers to the atonement for the priesthood and people, the second to the purification of the holy place.

(12) The words לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו in Lev. xvi. 10 are so difficult that it is not surprising that they have been rejected as an unskilful gloss (as by Ritschl). The interpretation (*e.g.* by Klaiber), "*ut per eum fiat expiatio*," is as contrary to the usage of the language as "*ad expiandum eum sc. Deum*;" neither does the hitherto admitted meaning, "that an atonement may be made upon him," agree with the prevailing use of כִּפֶּר עַל. Besides, what follows ver. 21 is no act of expiation.

(13) All victims indeed were, so far as they were without blemish, in themselves pure. But it is quite another case when the animal is to represent the people, not with their unatoned transgressions, but as having been already atoned for. Such representation can only take place by effecting an act of expiation for the animal itself.

(14) Not merely one hand, as in the Semikha, but two, to make the transaction, as Keil remarks, the more solemn and impressive.

(15) That that the high priest might have immediate information of the arrival of the goat at its destination, a kind of telegraphic line of watchmen on eminences, to give signals by waving cloths, was subsequently made from Jerusalem to the wilderness (*Joma*, vi. 8; comp. also Geiger, *Lesestücke aus der Mischna*, p. 16 sq.).

(16) This, according to Lev. xvi. 24, was again an atonement for himself and the people, because even after the great act of atonement, no offerings could be made without the atoning element present in every burnt-offering.

(17) The same offerings that were prescribed for the first day of the seventh month, viz. a bullock, a ram, and seven yearling lambs for a burnt-offering, with their corresponding food-offerings, viz. of fine flour kneaded with oil, three tenths of an ephah for the bullock, two tenths for the ram, and one tenth for each of the seven lambs, and finally a he-goat as a sin-offering. These sacrifices were, as at other festivals, independent of the continual burnt-offering with which the day began and ended. According to tradition (*M. Joma*, vii. 4; Maimonides, iv. 2, at the close), the high priest, after the evening sacrifice, again put on the linen garments, to fetch from the Holy of Holies the incense vessels (pan and vase) which had been left there. Thus tradition asserts a fourfold entry of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies, while the law, Lev. xvi., appears to direct him to enter it at least twice, or, according to the most natural understanding of ver. 12, more probably three times. To the notion of a fourth entry, however, nothing decided can be opposed. When it is said, Heb. ix. 7, of the high priest that he entered *once every year* into the holiest place, the expression is to be explained by its contrast to διὰ παντός; it stands *de uno anni die et de uno eodemque ministerio*, as Deyling (*de ingressu summi pontif.*, etc., *Obs.* ii. p. 183) has justly remarked. If, as has been attempted, the functions of censing and of the twofold sprinkling are to be compressed into one single entrance of the high priest into the Holy of Holies, recourse must be had to unnatural hypotheses.

§ 141.

Continuation: Signification of the Ritual and Antiquity of the Day of Atonement.

After what has been said (§ 127, 139) on atoning sacrifice, we have only to add what follows on the *signification* of the ritual of the Day of Atonement. Of course the greatest prominence must be given in this ritual to that element in the sacrifice by which an atonement for sin is effected, and to that portion of the sacrificial

transaction which specifically subserves this end. If the *pœna vicaria* is the idea upon which the sin-offering is founded, it is here if anywhere that we should expect to find it most distinctly impressed. But nothing at all is said of substitutionary suffering for sin, either on the part of the bullock and the goat whose blood was brought into the Holy of Holies, or of the goat which was dismissed into the wilderness, the slaying of the sin-offering being spoken of in the fewest possible words. It must be conceded (as has been already done, § 127, note 13) that the subsequent connection of this idea with the slaughter of the victim was a natural one (1),—that its death must be received not merely as the *means* of obtaining the blood, but also as an act of satisfaction. But nowhere in the laws concerning sacrifice can we find a foundation for the dogma, that it is only because the victim *accomplishes* something for the offerer, by vicariously suffering the penalty of death, that its life, offered in the blood, can serve as an atonement for him (2). On the contrary, it is only the *nature* of the victim, its purity and freedom from blemish, that are here dwelt on (3). The connection also of the idea of the *pœna vicaria* with the sending away of the second goat, by later Judaism, rests entirely on misunderstanding. For the sins laid upon the latter were those already *forgiven*, not those that had to be atoned for, unless we are to regard them as symbolically punished twice over. The meaning of the confession of sin made (according to ver. 21) over the second goat can only be that of a declaration, that past sins being forgiven, are now done away with,—are dismissed and relegated to the evil spirit, whose realm is situate beyond all connection with the abode of the holy people. In like manner the bird, set free at the purification of the *leprous* man and house, symbolically takes away the leprosy with him (Lev. xiv. 7, 53). It is also an error to see in the second goat an offering to Azazel (4). Mosaism acknowledges no evil power, independent of God, whose favor must be in some way secured. The point is not to propitiate, but to get rid of Azazel —to declare to him that the nation, now that it has obtained forgiveness of sin, has nothing to do with him, the patron of evil (5). Hengstenberg ingeniously discovers in this transaction with Azazel a reference to the Typhonic rites of the Egyptians. Typhon is the evil god who dwells especially in the Libyan desert, and who must be propitiated in times of pestilence. But while the Egyptian religion held it necessary to enter into relations with the powers of evil, for the sake of being secure from their enmity, Israel was to be taught by the rites of the Day of Atonement, that they had only to satisfy the holy God for their sins, and that when this was done the power of evil could do them no harm. Diestel, on the other hand, endeavors to show ("Set-Typhon, Asasel, und Satan," *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* 1860, p. 159 sq.) that the notion of Typhon as the evil principle is much later than the times of Moses, and not earlier than the 10th or 11th century before Christ (6).

As the day of Atonement formed the climax of what the Mosaic ritual was able from its own resources to effect with respect both to extent and degree of atonement, it closes the enactments concerning expiation, and may from this point of view be denominated its *Supreme Solemnity* (7). *Without the day of Atonement there would be an actual gap in the theocratic ordinances.* The law whose task was the restoration of a holy people, but which was at the same time continually exposing the opposition in which this people stood to the holy God through their

sinfulness, could not be without an institution to show the way in which this opposition might be reconciled by an atonement for the congregation, and also relatively to secure such reconciliation; while at the same time, being weak through the flesh, it pointed beyond itself to that perfect atonement whose result will be the restoration of the truly sanctified people of God (comp. Zech. iii. 9, Heb. ix. 6 sq.) (8). Ewald (*Antiquities*, p. 361), seeing more clearly in this matter than the uncircumcised criticism of the ordinary stamp, designates the day of Atonement "a genuine Mosaic festival, in which, more than in any other, the whole tendency as well as the full strictness of the higher religion was expressed." When the silence of other books of the Old Testament is adduced as an objection to the antiquity of this festival, the doubtful nature of such an argument is evident from the fact, that we must then, to be consistent, postpone its origin till the third century before Christ; for the first intimation of this festival, apart from the probable allusion to it in Zech. iii. 9, is found in Sirach l. 5 (in the description of the splendid appearance of the high priest Simon on coming out of the Holy of Holies), and in 3 Macc. i. 11. It was a solemnity carried on in silence, and except in the fast observed by the people, entirely confined to the sanctuary, and thus furnished no occasion for observation (9). At most, it might have been mentioned in 1 Kings viii. 65, and 2 Chron. vii. 9, etc., when it took place during the seven days' festival held at the dedication of Solomon's temple; an essential portion of this solemnity (the purification of the sanctuary) was performed, however, in the very act of dedication (10).

(1) The modern Jewish ceremony called the *Kapporeth*, and performed on the day of preparation for this solemnity, is founded entirely on the idea of substitution. A man takes a cock, a woman a hen (of a white color, on account of Isa. i. 18), and before killing strikes three times on its forehead, saying the words: זה חליפתי זה תחתי זה כפרתי זה התרנגול ילך למיתה ואני אלך לחיים טובים עם כל ישראל אמן, "May this cock [or hen] be an exchange for me, may it be in my stead! May it be a propitiation for me! Let this cock go to death, but may I go to a good life with all Israel! Amen." The four capital punishments of strangling, beheading, stoning, and burning are symbolized on the cock. See the description of the ceremony in Buxtorf's *Synagoga judaica*, ed. 3, cap. xxv. p. 509 sqq.

(2) As is again maintained by Küper (*Das Priesterthum des Alten Bundes*, 1866, p. 125). In so important a matter we are fully justified in appealing to the *argumentum e silentio*.

(3) The blood is regarded as a means of atonement which God has *given* to his people upon the altar (Lev. xvii. 11), to enable him who by reason of his sinfulness could not approach God, to draw near, because the life of the sinless animal intervenes to atone for his soul. Wherein, then, lies the efficacy of the expiation made on the Day of Atonement by means of the blood of the victim? Not in an increased quantity of the means of atonement. Not the blood of a hecatomb, but only the blood of a single animal is needed as an atonement for the high priest and people. It is, moreover, characteristic of the sin-offerings in general, that they are all limited to a single animal. The reason probably is, that the speciality of the sin-offering is not the *gift*, the oblation on the part of the offerer, in which case there might be, as the burnt-offerings show, a question of more or less, but the covering prescribed of God, by a means which, in virtue of its *quality* (as substituting a *soul* for the soul), is adapted to this end, but which by reason of this very quality is incapable of enhancement. (In this manner might the view stated by Kurtz, be completed.) The atonement made on the Day of Atonement was super-

eminent, because on this occasion the blood was brought as near to God as possible, before His throne, and indeed within the veil, into that central seat of His abode at other times unapproachable, thus making satisfaction for the people in the very place where the accusing law within the ark testified against them. The people, knowing themselves to be accepted with favor through the atoning blood, were assured of the continued dwelling of God in the midst of them, and therewith of the continuance of their state of grace, while the ordinary intercourse effected in worship between God and the congregation received a fresh consecration from this centre,—the blood taken into the Holy of Holies serving for the cleansing of even the outmost parts of the sanctuary.

(4) This explanation is inadmissible, even when the offering is taken in the broader meaning of a gift by which, according to Rabbinical views, the devil (Sammael) was to be induced not to render the sacrifice offered by Israel as an atonement inefficacious, and to become not an accuser of, but an intercessor for the people (see Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. p. 155 sq. ; Bähr, *id.* p. 686.

(5) If the later idea of Satan is unjustifiably transferred to Azazel, the notion that he can no longer accuse Israel before God, nor provoke God's wrath and chastisement against them, would have to be added (see Kurtz, *id.* p. 402). Besides, the second goat, considered in itself, cannot be regarded as a sacrifice. Both goats are indeed (Lev. xvi. 5) said to be לְחַטָּאת, but this only denotes in a general manner the purpose for which the two are together brought forward, while in vers. 9 and 15 the first goat which is slain is specially called חַטָּאת, but not the second. The latter, on whom the result of the atonement just offered is fulfilled, takes the place of the slain goat, and is, as it were, and as it is often designated, the *hircus redivivus*. Jewish tradition also recognized this relation between the two goats, by prescribing (*Joma*, vi. 1) that they should be alike in color, size, and value.

(6) [In the first edition it was said, in accordance with the article "Versöhnungstag" in Herzog : The requirement that the man who led the goat into the wilderness must bathe before returning into the camp is natural, because the wilderness is the region of impurity. The same reason was assigned in respect to the man charged with the duty of burning the flesh of the sin-offering, since this also took place outside the camp. Kurtz has correctly remarked that the supreme holiness of the day demanded that even the mere possibility of Levitical uncleanness, which might easily take place outside the camp, should be guarded against. On the other hand, it may certainly be maintained, as Riehm has done, that there is no evidence that residence outside the camp was regarded as bringing uncleanness ; for the Israelites went out of the camp every day to gather manna, and did not thereby become unclean. Still, there is no reason for explaining, with Riehm (p. 73 sq.), the purification required of the priest who had charge of the burning, on the ground that the flesh of the sin-offering was like him who was under the ban, an object of the destroying wrath of God. According to Lev. vi. 27 (comp. § 139), a garment sprinkled with the *blood* of the sin-offering must be washed, and this even, on Riehm's view, on account of the holiness of the blood. Now, from the circumstance that the supreme holiness of the flesh of the sin-offering required the subsequent purification of the priest who had burned it, there is no ground for the inference that the *flesh* of the sin-offering was holy in any way different from the *blood* of the offering. Who that reads Lev. vi. 27 could understand the holiness of the flesh of the sin-offering in a sense entirely different from the holiness of the blood of the sin-offering ?]

(7) The circumstance that this day did not bear the name חג is discussed in § 144 on the Sacred Seasons.

(8) The need of such an institution is especially seen with respect to the year of jubilee, which, without it, would appear in the national life without cause, and would lack such a close of the preceding period as the Divine holiness demands.

(9) It is also probable that this solemnity, like other institutions of worship, fell for a long period into desuetude. [Against Wellhausen, according to whom

(i. 113 sqq.) the Day of Atonement was not instituted until after the year 444, comp. Dillmann, p. 524 sqq., and Delitzsch, "The Day of Atonement," in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, 1880.]

(10) The Day of Atonement is omitted in the prophetic institutions of Ezekiel, while a compensation for it is given in the enactment (xlv. 18–20) of a cleansing of the sanctuary, "for every one that erreth and is simple," at the beginning of the year, viz. on the first and seventh of Nisan, and therefore preparatory to the Passover. (Ezekiel generally includes the sin-offerings among his institutions of worship, while other prophets, on the contrary, when speaking of Divine service in the times of redemption, no longer make mention of sin-offerings.) A collection of the most important traditional enactments, whose validity may be assumed, for the later period of the second temple, may be seen in the article quoted, p. 456 sqq. On the form assumed by the celebration of the Day of Atonement, since the destruction of Jerusalem, see *Orach. Chajim*, translated by Löwe, p. 150 sqq.; Buxtorf, *idem*, cap. 25 sq.; Schröder, *Satzungen und Gebräuche des talmudisch-rabbinischen Judenthums*, p. 130 sqq. Comp. also the article *Kol Nidre* in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* viii. p. 24 sq.

APPENDIX: PURIFICATIONS (1).

§ 142.

1. *The Levitical Purifications.*

The Israelite, as pertaining to the holy people, was to be *clean* (טָהוֹר); and therefore when he had, though unavoidably, incurred uncleanness, or come in contact with anything unclean, and so become טָמֵא, he was to restore his state of cleanness by a special act. Everything relating to *sexual* conditions—generation, birth, etc.—or to death and corruption was *defiling* (Lev. xii. and xv.). In the latter respect, not only was uncleanness contracted by means of the human corpse and all connected with it,—the grave, the house in which one had died, nay, even every open vessel in it, Lev. xix. 11, 15–16,—but also by the carcass of an unclean animal, Lev. v. 3, xi. 8, and the body of a clean animal if it had not met its death by being properly slaughtered, xi. 39 sq. Finally, the disease of *leprosy*, ch. xiii. sq., which was regarded as a process of gradual corruption, rendered the man visited therewith unclean, the leper being designated, Num. xii. 12, as one like a dead man, and the healing of a leper, 2 Kings v. 7, as a making alive. The law, Lev. xiv. 33 sq., also gives directions concerning a house-leprosy, the nature of which is not clearly known (2). The chief *means* of purification was running *water*, which is itself a symbol of life, and therefore called *living* water (מַיִם חַיִּים, Lev. xiv. 5, 50, Num. xix. 17, etc.). In uncleanness of the *lower* degree, the washing of the unclean person or thing (if the latter were not of a brittle nature, in which case it was to be destroyed) and separation till sunset were sufficient (see Lev. xi. 23 sq., xv. 4 sq., xvi. sq.); the bringing of a sin-offering being, under certain circumstances, also required (v. 2). In uncleanness of the *higher* degree, the separation lasted seven, or in some cases fourteen days; and under certain circumstances a sin-offering of birds was added (xiv. 13–15.) During the march through the desert, all who had contracted uncleanness were banished from the camp. On the other hand, in cases of uncleanness incurred through contact with a dead body, a certain *water of sprinkling* was applied, called מֵי נִדָּה (water against uncleanness), which is itself designated as a sin-offering, Num. xix.

9, 17. It was prepared as follows:—A red heifer without blemish, which had as yet borne no yoke, was slaughtered without the camp in the presence of the priest (3); its blood was then sprinkled seven times toward the sanctuary. It, viz. its flesh, blood, skin, and dung, together with cedar wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop, was then cast into the fire and burnt. The three last-named ingredients appear also at the purification of the leper, Lev. xiv. 6. Every person officiating at this ceremony was unclean till evening. The ashes obtained were laid up in a clean place without the camp, and every dwelling in which there had been a corpse, together with all the persons and vessels therein, was purified on the third and on the seventh days, by means of a bunch of hyssop dipped into water into which some of these ashes had been cast. The *red* color in these symbols of purification must not be explained (as by Hengstenberg) as a symbol of sin, on the ground that red was in Egypt the symbol of Typhon; nor the red heifer combined, as by Schelling (*Philosophie der Offenbarung*, ii. p. 136), with the red bullock to be sacrificed to Typhon (Plutarch, *de Ig. et Osir.* cap. 31). Isa. i. 18 proves nothing in this matter,—red there certainly referring, as the color of blood, to deeds of blood (see vers. 15 and 21), while the death with whose expiation the red heifer was concerned is not represented as blood-shedding, but as corruption. Red is rather the color of life and of vital energy; scarlet the color of splendour; the animal is a *female*, the sex that brings forth, properly representing life (comp. Gen. iii. 5). *Cedar* as the most durable of woods, is likewise a symbol of incorruption; while great purifying power was in ancient times always ascribed to hyssop. Thus the water of purification is an *infusion, strengthened* by *elements which symbolized vital energy, incorruption, and purity* (4).

(1) Compare Sommer, *Bibl. Abhandl.* p. 200 sqq.; Kurtz "on the Symbolical Dignity of the Rite prescribed in Num. xix. for the Annulling of the Uncleanness of Death," in Ullmann's *Studien*, 1846, No. 3, p. 629 sqq. [Köhler i. p. 409 sqq.; Kamphausen's article "Reinigkeit und Reinigungen" in Riehm].

(2) Some understand by this the injury done to walls by dry-rot, while others, on the contrary, think a transference of human leprosy to the walls of a house possible.

(3) Not of the High Priest, who might not come in contact with anything relating to death or corruption.

(4) With respect to the ceremonies by which the purification of a recovered leper (Lev. xiv. 1–32) or of a leprous house (vers. 33–57) was effected, the meaning of the essential points is determined by what has already been said; compare also what is remarked on this subject in § 140 sq.

§ 143.

2. *Acts of Purification for removing the Suspicion of Guilt.*

Of an entirely different character were those acts of purification which related to the *denial of suspected crimes*, viz. *adultery and murder*.

Among these are (1st) the *jealousy-offering*, and the *drinking of the water of cursing*, treated of Num. v. 11–31, and already mentioned in § 104. 1, where a statement of the marriage laws is given (1). This jealousy-offering, which a husband had to present to the priest when he placed his wife, whom he suspected of adultery, before the altar, consisted of *barley meal without the addition of oil and frankincense*.

This offering does not, however, as Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 446) supposes, concern the husband, but the wife, as ver. 15 plainly says, "her offering for her" (2). It is called, ver. 15, "an offering of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance;" *i.e.*, it is to bring the iniquity of the wife to the remembrance of God, that He may effect its detection. This offering, even though it be forced upon the woman, is purely one of supplication. There is in this case no question of any atonement (כִּפֻּר), for sin is not to be covered, but discovered (3). The nature of the offering must correspond with the case in question; the capacity in which the offerer appears before God must be impressed upon it. This offering, which is composed of the meanest kind of food-offering, is not, however, intended (as Keil, *Archäol.* i. p. 299, explains it) as a symbol of the kind of life hitherto led by the woman, for the Divine judgment concerning this is yet to be obtained (4). On the contrary, without involving any prejudging of the past, it exhibits in an entirely objective manner the condition in which the offerer is placed (5). As an accused person appears before the tribunal in mourning attire, without the question of his guilt or innocence being in any way affected, so may this sacrifice be said to exhibit a merely *gloomy character*. Hence its material was not fine wheat flour, but the less esteemed *barley meal* (4). The absence of the *oil* and *incense*, the usual accompaniments of the Minhha, was designed, according to our view, merely to express still more emphatically the gloomy nature of the offering, which was to be neither savory nor sweet-scented (comp. § 125, Conclusion).

The further proceedings were as follows: The priest placed the accused before the Lord, by leading her before the altar of burnt-offering in the court of the tabernacle. He then took *holy* water in an *earthen* vessel, *i.e.* probably some of the water kept for sacred purposes in the laver in the court (Ex. xxx. 18) (5), and placed therein dust from *the floor of the tabernacle*. He then *uncovered the head of the woman*, placed the meat-offering in her hands, and himself holding the vessel in which was the "curse-causing water of pain," invoked a curse upon her, to the effect that if she were guiltless she should be free from the effects of the water of cursing, but that if she were guilty this water should enter into her body "to cause her belly to swell and her thigh to rot" (6). The woman having taken the curse upon her by twice saying: Amen, the priest wrote the curses (according to Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 11. 16, merely the name of God) upon a paper, or, according to tradition, upon a roll of parchment (*διφθέρα*, Josephus, comp. *Sota*, ii. 4), and wiped out the writing with the water of cursing. He then took the offering of jealousy out of the woman's hand, waved it before the Lord, and burnt a handful of it upon the altar as a memorial (see § 129), and gave the woman the water to drink.

The *uncovering of the head* (by removing the veil and unbinding the hair) did not indicate (as Theodoret explains it) that all things are naked and open before God, but denoted the defilement which the woman had contracted in virtue of the accusation brought against her, the veiling of the head being the token of female modesty. An *earthen* vessel was employed, as being of little value. The mingling of dust in the water may be explained (as first suggested by Bähr, *idem*, p. 443) by Gen. iii. 14, comp. with Ps. lxxii. 9, Mic. vii. 17, Isa. xlix. 23, according to which passages, to eat dust was a general mark of meriting a curse, or of the deepest shame and humiliation. *Holy* water and dust *from the floor of the sanctuary*

were used, to enhance the efficacy of the potion, which thus appeared all the more to be the vehicle of the Divine holiness, whose property is to destroy all that is sinful. In virtue of the efficacy imparted to the water by the words of the oath, and by the blotting out of the written curse, it was called the "curse-causing water of pain" (7). The entrance of the curse into the inmost parts of the body was to be effected by drinking (comp. the expression Ps. cix. 18). We say *effected*, not merely symbolized. For, according to the simple meaning of the words of ver. 27, the water is to be regarded not merely as the symbol and pledge, but as the actual vehicle of the Divine curse (8). Any element of magic is excluded by the ethical element which was added, inasmuch as the effect of the potion was promoted by the anxiety of an evil conscience in the case of the guilty woman, and averted by the gladness of a good conscience in that of the innocent (9).

(2d) *The purification of a community from the suspicion of blood-guiltiness*, when a slain man was found in the neighborhood, and the murderer could not be discovered. For this case the law (Deut. xxi. 1–9) prescribed that the elders of the city should lead a young heifer, which had not yet been wrought with, into a valley in which was a brook, and should there, in the presence of the priests, break its neck, and wash their hands over the slain heifer, saying: "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O Lord, unto Thy people Israel, whom Thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood in the midst of Thy people Israel," *i.e.* let not this blood shed in the midst of us be laid to our charge, etc. *The object of this transaction* was not an atonement. There was here no question of a transgression committed through ignorance; and the expression denoting the slaughter of the victim is not שָׁחַט, but עָרַף. The blood shed was to be removed from the midst of the people, and this was effected by the symbolical infliction of capital punishment upon the heifer. This was to proceed from the elders, because, according to ch. xix. 12, it was upon them that the duty of inquiring into mortal injuries in general devolved. Here, then, the idea of a *pœna vicaria* applies: satisfaction is to be made to Divine justice by a symbolical infliction of punishment, which thus serves, ver. 8, for a covering of blood-guiltiness to the community in question. The elders, by the *act of washing hands*, deny, in the name of the community, all participation in the mortal injury which has been done; perhaps the brook was to carry away also the blood of the heifer. The priests do not in this instance officiate as mediators of atonement, but, ver. 5, merely as witnesses and judicial functionaries.

(1) Compare my article, "Eiferopfer," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xix. p. 472 sq. An explanation of this offering, as well as the subsequent practice, is given in the Talmudic treatise *Sota*, edited, with an ample commentary, by Wagenseil, 1674; compare also Selden, *Uxor hebraica*, iii. chs. 13–15; Lund, *Jüdische Heiligthümer*, p. 701 sq.

(2) [So also Köhler, i. p. 408.] It was, according to ver. 25, taken out of the hand of the woman. The husband necessarily furnished the materials, both because the wife, as such, had no property of her own, and especially because the whole transaction originated with him, and was performed without regard to the consent of the wife.

(3) An offering in a general sense was, however, needed, because, as Bähr (*id.*, p. 445) quite correctly states it, according to the Mosaic ordinances no one who approached the Lord in His sanctuary for any purpose was to appear empty (Ex.

xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 20), *i.e.* without an offering. Hence the presentation of an offering was to precede the drinking of the water of cursing, as an introduction to the whole transaction.

(4) Comp. Hos. iii. 2, where barley appears as the food becoming an adulteress. The Jewish explanation goes so far as to say (*Sota*, ii. 1) that, because the act of the adulteress placed her on a level with the cattle, her offering also must consist of the food of the cattle. In this case, however, the woman would be assumed to be guilty, which is out of the question.

(5) So Onkelos, and *Sota*, ii. 2; while the LXX, on the contrary, translate *ὕδωρ καθαρὸν ζῶν*, and thus understand it simply as pure spring water.

(6) During the transaction, time was still given to the woman to confess; a pause is probably to be assumed after ver. 20.

(7) The expression מָרִים is to be referred, as is shown especially by ver. 27, not to the bitter taste, but to the pernicious effects of the water. The Rabbins, on the contrary, understood the word literally, and disputed whether anything bitter was mingled with the water, or whether it first acquired a bitter taste in the mouth of the adulteress who drank of it.

(8) Keil justly remarks (*idem*, p. 301) that this water is said to acquire, through the word and power of God, a supernatural power, which, though not to be conceived of as magical, really produces, through its influence on the mind, pernicious effects upon the body of the guilty, and is harmless to the innocent.

(9) For later traditions, see the article quoted, p. 475 sq.

III.—THE SACRED SEASONS.

THE SACRED SEASONS IN GENERAL (1)

§ 144.

Survey of the Sacred Seasons and their Designations.

The sanctification of the course of time in general was effected by the morning and evening sacrifice, עוֹלַת תָּמִיד (of which we spoke, § 131). Besides this, however, special times were also selected, which, establishing by a regular interchange of labor and rest a rule of *natural* life corresponding with a need of human nature, offered at the same time a substratum for the communion taking place in worship between God and His people. Such sacred seasons, as appointed in the Pentateuch, were, 1*st*, The seventh day of the week, or *Sabbath*; 2*d*, The *new moons*,—the first-born, as it were, among the days of the month. These were of subordinate importance, with the exception of the seventh new moon, which was invested with a festal character, and bore the name of יוֹם תְּרוּעָה, the Day of Trumpets. 3*d*, The three *festival pilgrimages*, when the whole congregation assembled at the sanctuary, viz.: *a.* the *Passover*, with which the annual cycle of festivals commenced in spring, celebrated in the first month of the Mosaic year (Ex. xii. 2), on the evening of the 14th Abib or Nisan, with the seven days of unleavened bread, kept from the 15th day of the same month onward; *b.* the *Feast of Weeks* (Pentecost), seven weeks later; *c.* the *Feast of Tabernacles*, from the 15th day of the seventh month onward. 4*th*, The seventh month Tisri, besides being distinguished, as above remarked, by the festal character of its new moon, included also the *Day of Atonement* (יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים). In this month the עֲצֶרֶת (Lev. xxiii. 36), which took place on the eighth day, *i.e.* after the seven days' celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles (the 22d day of the month), terminated the festal half of the

year. *5th*, Every seventh year was also sacred as the *sabbatical year*, and every seventh sabbatical year as the *year of jubilee*. The laws concerning sacred seasons in general are contained in Ex. xxiii. 10–17, Lev. xxiii. and xxv., Num. xxviii., xxix., and Deut. xvi. In Deuteronomy as well as in Exodus, only the three festival pilgrimages are mentioned; while the sabbatical solemnities (except in the Decalogue, v. 12 sq.) and the new moons are passed over in silence. This circumstance is explained by the consideration that it is in these festival pilgrimages alone that stress is laid upon that oneness of the sanctuary which it is the special object of Deuteronomy in its enactments concerning worship to inculcate (see Deut. xvi. 5–7, 11, 15, 16) (2).

The most general *designation* of the sacred seasons which have an appointed order of succession is מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה,—מוֹעֵד signifying an appointed time in general; comp. Num. xxviii. 2. The expression is also used in the superscription, Lev. xxiii. 2, of all holy days, including the Sabbath, on which a holy convocation (מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ) took place; and therefore, in Ezek. xlvi. 11 (see Hitzig *in loco*), of the new moons also, for these were, according to prophetic legislation, to be days of holy convocation (Ezek. xlvi. 3, comp. with Isa. lxvi. 23), which they were not as yet in the Pentateuch. More frequently, however, the expression מוֹעֲדִים is used in a narrower sense, and restricted, to the exclusion of the new moons and Sabbaths, to the days of assembling at the annual festivals (Lev. xxiii. 4; Ezek. xlvi. 9; 2 Chron. viii. 13, xxxi. 3). Still narrower is the meaning of the word חַג, which is the usual name for the three festival pilgrimages, as the *rejoicing festivals* of the year. The name seems to have arisen from the cheerful dances performed at these seasons (see Judg. xxi. 19–21; compare also, in illustration, Ex. xxxii. 5 with ver. 19), the verbal root חָגַג properly meaning to turn in a circle (3). Hence this word could not be used of the solemn Day of Atonement, which subsequently bore only the name of *the Day*, κ. ἐξ. יוֹמָא, or *the Great Day*, יוֹמָא רַבָּא (4).

(1) Compare my article *Festivals of the Ancient Hebrews* in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* [Riehm's art. "Feste" in his *Handbuch.*]

(2) On other differences in the laws concerning the feasts, see the separate discussions concerning them.

(3) In Arabic, the word *hhaggun* is the name by which the pilgrimages to Mecca are denoted.

(4) That the expression חַג is already used, as is frequently asserted, in the Old Testament, κ. ἐξ. of the Feast of Tabernacles as the greatest of the rejoicing festivals of the year, cannot be inferred with any certainty from 1 Kings viii. 2, Ezek. xlv., 2 Chron. vii. 8, since the reference made in these passages to the Feast of Tabernacles naturally arises from the context. Judg. xxi. 19 may, moreover, be understood also of the Passover. Comp. Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 66.

§ 145.

Reasons which determine the Times of the Feasts.

The *number seven*, which from Gen. ii. 2 sq. onward is the sign of Divine perfection (1), forms the fundamental type for the regulation of the sacred seasons. It directly determines the order of the *sabbatical* seasons (§ 147 sq.), and also ex-

erts an influence upon the order of the feasts; for, first, the duration of two of the principal ones is (as appears from § 144) for seven days; secondly, in the annual cycle of festivals, the seven weeks between Passover and Pentecost branch out into a special circle of feasts: and, finally, the entire number of days of holy convocation, *i.e.* of chief days of feasts, amounts to just seven (the Passover and Feast of Tabernacles having each two days of convocation). Of the five yearly festivals, the three festal pilgrimages, Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, have both an *agrarian* and an *historical* significance, but the latter does not occur in the Old Testament in the case of the Feast of Pentecost (2). The *Day of Atonement* had, notwithstanding its special and particular significance, an unmistakable relation to the Feast of Tabernacles: as the Passover introduced the harvest festival of unleavened bread, so the Day of Atonement led to the supreme rejoicing of the year in the Feast of Tabernacles. This position of the Day of Atonement indicates that only a people reconciled to God has a right to rejoice in the blessing with which He has crowned the year; see, on the contrary, Hos. ix. 1 sq. (3). The Day of Atonement served also as an introduction to the year of jubilee (§ 152), which, according to the agricultural year, began at harvest (4). No hint is given in the law as to the reason why this solemnity was to take place on the tenth day of the seventh month (5). The choice of the day has undoubtedly a reflex meaning,—the first decade of the sabbath month was thus to be made a season of repentance and self-examination; and modern Judaism has declared the days from the first to the tenth Tisri, days of penitence. The *changes of the moon*, not to mention the new moons, determined the time for celebrating the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles, which both took place at the full moon; the after-Passover was also celebrated by those who were prevented from celebrating the Passover proper, at the next full moon (Num. ix. 9–13, comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 2); hence ἀπὸ σελήνης σημεῖον ἑορτῆς, Wisd. xlii. 7. It must further be stated that the Passover took place at about the vernal, the Feast of Tabernacles at about the autumnal, equinox (6). Notwithstanding all this, however, it is quite erroneous *to deduce the significance of the sacred seasons of Mosaism from cosmical relations.* For heathenism, indeed, which identifies the life and government of Deity with the life of the world, the seasons of the year, as such, are at the same time God's seasons, and hence the conspicuous elements of the sun's or the moon's course have been chiefly used as festal seasons (comp. Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. p. 546). According to the Old Testament view, on the contrary, the laws of the heavenly bodies were to serve as a chronometer for the theocratic ordinances (Gen. i. 14; Ps. civ. 19), that the harmony of the laws of nature with the laws of the covenant might be manifested in this manner also. The new moons at most could be regarded as the chronological feasts which George, *e.g.* (*Die alteren jüdischen Feste*, 1835, p. 193 sq.), has called a certain class of Jewish festivals; these hold, however, a very subordinate position in the Pentateuch (see § 150). It may certainly be conjectured, as by Ewald (7), that the Israelites (though we have no sufficient data for the assertion) had a solemnity at the appearance of the full moon, and also solemnities at the seasons of spring and harvest, in pre-Mosaic times; we may also, with Philo (8) and the moderns, see in the splendor of the full moon a special glorification of the Passover and Feast of Tabernacles. But what made these feasts, feasts, and the

Sabbaths holy days, was not human choice, guided by the order of nature, but the enactments of the covenant God, who on the one hand preserved by these festivals a lively remembrance of the great facts of His deliverance and guidance of His people (comp. Ex. xiii. 9, Lev. xxiii. 42 sq., etc.), and on the other admonished the people to follow their earthly vocation to an agricultural life, in constant dependence on the Giver of all the blessings of nature, and to regard these blessings as inalienably connected with the ordinances of the covenant.

(1) On the sacred numbers, see Kliefoth, "die Zahlensymbolik der hl. Schrift," *Theol. Zeitschrift von Dieckhoff und Kliefoth*, 1862, pp. 1–89, 241–453, 509–623; and also Leyrer's article, "Zahlen bei den Hebräern," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xviii. p. 360 sq.

(2) Which may explain why it seems to occupy a lower position than the other two, and is entirely omitted in the prophecy of Ezekiel, xlv. 21 sq.

(3) Comp. Hupfeld, *de primitiva et vera festorum ap. Hebræos ratione*, ii. p. 12: "*Quæ enim esset terræ et proventuum consecratio a populo profano peracta, h. e. communis vitæ labe polluto, nisi antea lustratus et expiatus se denuo sacraverit?*" Hos. ix. 1 sqq., a prophetic saying, referring most probably to the Feast of Tabernacles, rings out the threatening, "Rejoice not, O Israel," etc., in the midst of the harvest-rejoicings of the apostate people.

(4) Even the relation in which the Day of Atonement stands to the year of jubilee, shows that its significance must not be limited to that of an introductory solemnity to the Feast of Tabernacles. The high rank accorded to it among the Mosaic solemnities entirely forbids our placing it on a level with the preparation for the Passover on the 10th Nisan (§ 153), which had no festal character at all.

(5) See in Carpzov's *Appar. antiq. s. cod.* p. 433, the Rabbinical fancies on this subject, viz. because Adam sinned and repented on the 10th Tisri, or because Abraham was circumcised on this day, or because this was the day on which Moses came down from the mount and made an atonement for transgression with the golden calf, etc. Philo (*de septen.* ed. M. ii. p. 297) points to the significance of the number ten as the number of perfection, which he then, in his manner, refers to the ethical value of the fast prescribed on this day. According to Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 673), the Day of Atonement is by the number ten designated as the most comprehensive and perfect of days; so too Kürtz (*Sacrificial Worship*, p. 387).

(6) Philo, *de septen.* ed. M. ii. p. 297, interprets this point in his own manner. Article, *Feste der alten Hebr.*

(7) Comp. Ewald, "De feriarum hebr. origine ac ratione," *Zeitschr. für Kunde des Morgenlandes*, ii. p. 414 sqq.

(8) See Philo, *idem*, p. 297: *ἵνα μὴ μεθ' ἡμέραν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ νύκτωρ πλήρης ὁ κόσμος ᾖ τοῦ παγκάλου φωτός*, comp. p. 293.

§ 146.

The Celebration of the Holy Days.

On the *celebration of the holy days*, the following general remarks may be made:

1. Besides the sacrifices prescribed for every day, certain *special public sacrifices*, differing in character according to the several festivals, also took place. The laws respecting these are found in Num. xxviii. and xxix.

2. On *seven annual feast-days* (the days of convocation mentioned § 145), namely, the first and seventh days of unleavened bread, the day of the Feast of Weeks, the new moon Sabbath, the Day of Atonement, and the first and last days of the Feast of Tabernacles, *rest from labor* was commanded as well as on the *weekly*

Sabbath. There was, however, this difference, that while on the weekly Sabbath and the Day of Atonement all labor (כָּל-מְלָאכָה) was forbidden (Lev. xxiii. 3, 31, comp. with Num. xxix. 7), on the other above-named six days of rest only כָּל-מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה (Vulg. *servile opus*) was proscribed, Lev. xxiii. 7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36, comp. Num. xxviii. 18, etc. The latter did not exclude, as is evident from Ex. xii. 16, the preparation of food (1). Hence in the Pentateuch the expression שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן (high day of rest), denoting the stricter abstinence from work, is used only of the weekly Sabbath and the Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 31, comp. xxiii. 28; while even the simpler expression שַׁבָּת is applied only to the rest-days of the feast of the seventh month (2), and, according to the common explanation of Lev. xxiii. 11, 15 to the first day of unleavened bread (3). In the intervening days of the two festival weeks, work was permitted (4).

3. The *positive* element in the celebration of the *weekly Sabbaths* and the *sabbatical feast-days* is contained in the regularly recurring formula מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ of Lev. xxiii. and Num. xxviii. This expression does not mean, as the LXX and Vulgate understand it, *κλητὴ ἁγία ἔσται ὑμῖν*, *vocabitur sanctus*, or, as Cocceius and Vitringa (see *Synag. vet.* p. 288 sq.), and among moderns Saalschütz (*Mosaisches Recht*, p. 387), by comparing Ex. xxxii. 5, Jer. xxxvi. 9, explain it, *indictio sancti*, *proclamatio sanctitatis*, but a *holy calling together*, and is intended to signify, as Ezekiel, xlvi. 3, 9, expresses it, that the people were to come to the sanctuary to worship. A *universal command*, however, to appear in the sanctuary (the רָאִיָה, according to later designation) only took place with regard to the three festal pilgrimages, and then was given only to the male population, Ex. xxiii. 14, 17, Deut. xvi. 16.

4. They who came to the feasts were not to appear before the Lord *empty* (Ex. xxiii. 15, comp. xxxiv. 20, Deut. xvi. 16), but each, as ver. 17 says, was to "give according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee." This refers to the free-will offerings, ver. 10, the Deuteronomian tenths (§ 136. 3), the first-born of cattle (§ 136. 1), the first-fruits (§ 136. 2), etc., and the peace-offerings formed of them, which were preceded by burnt-offerings, Num. x. 10, festal repasts following, comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 22 (5).

(1) See the thorough discussion of this matter in Gusset's *Lex. hebr.* ed. 2, pp. 817 sq. and 1582.

(2) Probably (as Gusset, *idem*, p. 1581, perceives) because these days derived a specially sabbatical character from the sabbatic month.

(3) According to another interpretation, Lev. xxiii. 11, 15 refers only to the weekly Sabbath (see Hupfeld, *idem*, p. 4). Bähr's assertion, *idem*, p. 582, that in the Old Testament the word Sabbath sometimes also designates the whole system of feasts and festal seasons, is quite incorrect. On the form of the word שַׁבָּתוֹן = *σαββατισμός*, see Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb.* § 163 *d.*

(4) The laws by which this liberty was subsequently limited, are given in the Mishna treatise *Moëd Katon*, ii. 11.

(5) Very few notices of the sacred seasons are found in the canonical books after the Pentateuch. This applies especially to the *book of Joshua*, which mentions (v. 10 sqq.) only the first Passover celebrated in the land of Canaan. If this book, closely connected as it is with the Pentateuch, and acknowledged to presuppose it, makes no further mention of festal celebrations and such matters, it must be plain to every unprejudiced reader how little the non-existence of the feasts can be inferred from the silence of subsequent books concerning them.

II. THE SABBATICAL SEASONS.

(*a*) THE WEEKLY SABBATH (1).

§ 147.

1. *Antiquity and Origin of the Sabbath.*

The word שַׁבָּת, which is mostly a feminine, was probably, as is shown by its form with suffixes (שַׁבַּתּוֹ), originally an abstract contracted from שַׁבָּתַת (rest, *ἀνάπαυσις*, Josephus, *Ant.* i. 1.) (2). The full expression is, however, יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת.

The Sabbath, which many regard as instituted in Paradise, and others derive, as the day of Saturn, from the oldest heathenism, viz. the Egyptian, is, according to the Pentateuch, of *purely Mosaic origin* (3). In Gen. ii. 1, indeed, the hallowing of the seventh day, but not the promulgation among men of a command to observe it, is connected with creation (4). In patriarchal times, too, we meet with no trace of the Sabbath. Accordingly [some of] the Fathers, when opposing Judaism, emphatically insisted that the righteous before the time of Moses obtained God's approbation, although they observed no Sabbath (5). The first injunction concerning the Sabbath appears, Ex. xvi. 5, 22–30, on the occasion of the gathering of the manna, and in a form which seems to indicate that the Sabbath was not then known to the people. It was not till they had been thus initiated in the celebration of the Sabbath, by experiencing the blessing resting upon it, that the special promulgation of the Sabbath command followed at Sinai. The expression used of the Sabbath, Ex. xx. 8, "*Remember*" (זָכוֹר), is not intended to recall the Sabbath to mind as an ancient institution, but requires the people to be from that time onward mindful of the Sabbath-day, and thus entirely corresponds with the "observe" (שָׁמוֹר) of the parallel passage, Deut. v. 12 (6). Neh. ix. 14 also testifies to the Mosaic origin of the Sabbath. To derive the Sabbath from *heathenism* is decidedly opposed to the *Old Testament*, which declares the Sabbath to be a *sign* between Jehovah and His people, whose part it is to acknowledge that the Lord has consecrated Israel to be His people (Ex. xxxi. 13; Ezek. xx. 12) (7). Neither can this derivation be supported by the history of religion (8). It is true that the notion of sacredness of the *number seven* was very widely diffused in antiquity; but this may be sufficiently explained by its frequent and significant occurrence in natural events, especially in the planetary system of the ancients and the course of the moon (9). The *cycle of the week*, too, which was perhaps originally formed as the quarter of the synodic lunar month (so Hengstenberg), though not perfectly corresponding thereto, reaches back to pre-Mosaic times (see Gen. xxix. 27 sq., and perhaps even vii. 4, 10, viii. 10, 12, xvii. 12, xxi. 4) (10). Still the week of seven days was by no means universally diffused in antiquity: the ancient Egyptians especially, to whom Dio Cassius, xxxvii. 18 sq. (11), refers the seven-days week, previously used, according to recent investigations (12), a ten-days division of time. [Until recently no trace of a religious observance of the seventh day, or any other week-day, could be shown (13), but George Smith (*The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, London, 1875) has now discovered that the Assyrians divided the first eight-and-twenty days of every month into four weeks of seven days each, and observed every last week-

day as a day of rest; and Fr. Delitzsch thinks he has found the word Sabbath in a list of synonyms (German translation of G. Smith's *Chaldee Genesis*, p. 300 sq.). But aside from the fact that these discoveries need confirmation, that the age of the witnesses in the case remains to be determined, and that it is still a question whether the Assyrians did not observe the seventh day because it was regarded as an unlucky day, the Mosaic Sabbath is, in any case, peculiar in its independence of the changes of the moon, and in its significance, as an institution consecrated to Jehovah, and resting upon the covenant relation of Israel to Jehovah.] (13). The customary combination of the Jewish Sabbath with the *day of Saturn* in Greek and Roman authors (14), rests upon the reference of the seven days of the week, to *the planets*. Of this the Old Testament knows nothing; and even in heathenism the notion does not seem of very great antiquity (15). Its general diffusion, says Dio Cassius, *idem*, is not yet old (16),—the passage in Herodotus, ii. 82, which informs us that among the Egyptians every month and day was sacred to some god, having reference to the days not (as is now proved) of the week, but of the month, each of the thirty days of the month having its special tutelar divinity. The oldest testimony for the practice in question is the oracular saying in Eusebius, *Præp. ev.* 5. 14, where the invocation of the seven planets on their seven days is referred to the magician Ostanes, who was, according to Pliny, *Hist. nat.* 30. 2, a contemporary of Xerxes. That succession of the planets, on which the naming of the days of the week is founded, rests, moreover, according to the above-cited passage of Dio Cassius (see on this matter Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, p. 941 sqq.), upon artificial theories, one of which assumes a division of the day into 24 hours. On this account it is a doubtful proceeding to attribute (as Baur does) to the identification of the Sabbath with Saturn's day the weight of a very ancient tradition. The association of ideas, however, which led to this combination may easily be perceived (17). The idea of an easy and happy life was so closely connected with the idea of Saturn (Hesiod, *Op. et d.* 170; Pindar, *Ol.* 2. 70 sq.), that *ὁ ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος* (Lucian. *Fugit.* 17) signified a lazy life (18). With the Romans, too, it was natural to compare the Jewish Sabbath with its leisure, and as being the day on which, as Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 4, comp. Justin, *Hist.* 36. 2) states the matter, their labors were once brought to an end by their deliverance from Egypt, with their own Saturnalia. No Roman or Grecian author, however, knows anything of any heathen celebration of the seventh day of the week. Such a celebration is, on the contrary, regarded by Roman authors as something specifically Jewish, and therefore as a fit subject of scorn for the satirists (19); Seneca, *e.g.*, considering that to keep the Sabbath was "*septimam fere partem ætatis perdere.*" When Josephus and Philo speak of a general diffusion of the rest of the Sabbath, this must be referred to the ever-increasing *imitation* of Jewish customs prevailing in those centuries (20); for the leisure of the seventh day was not only grateful to proselytes to Judaism, but was also adopted by the heathen (21), especially after the day of Saturn (of the "sidus triste," Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 569) was, in consequence of the introduction of eastern astrology, regarded as a *dies ater*, and consequently as unfavorable to any undertaking, especially to a journey (Tibull. i. 3. 18).

(1) Compare my article "Sabbath" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xiii. p. 193 sqq. [also Hessey's Bampton Lectures *on Sunday*, 1860 (3d ed. 1866); and on the other

side, Gilfillan *on the Sabbath*, 1862 ; and a series of articles by W. D. Love in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1880–81].

(2) According to another view (so Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb.* § 155 *c*), the word is said to be originally a masculine after the form קָטֶל, and to designate the day itself as the celebrator. The mode of expression, however, in several passages (*e.g.* Ex. xxxi. 15, "on the seventh day is שַׁבָּת") does not agree with this notion. (Compare also Böttcher, *Ausf. Lehrb.* § 621. 4, with note 2.) The view according to which שַׁבָּת is said to to be contracted from שַׁבְעַת (= ἑβδομάς, an expression which is certainly sometimes placed for the Sabbath, 2 Macc. vi. 11, xii. 38, etc.), and to denote the seventh day (Lact. *inst.* 7. 14 : *dies sabbati, qui lingua Hebræorum a numero nomen accepit*), rests on no better foundation than does the combination of the root שָׁבַת with שׁוּב by Bähr, *Symbolik des mos. Kultus*, ii. p. 532 sq. On the contemptuous explanation of this word in Apion, see Josephus in his work against the latter (ii. 2). The LXX, New Testament, Josephus, and others render the word not merely by τὸ σάββατον, but also by τὰ σάββατα ; the latter plural form with a singular meaning might have been an imitation of the Aramean form of the *stat. emph.*, but is probably to be explained by the analogy of the names of other sacred seasons, as ἐγκαίνια, ἄζυμα. Comp. Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, p. 21 ; the same, on the metaplasm in the declension of this plural.

(3) [Wellhausen, i. 116, observes that the observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest, necessarily presupposes fixed settlement and agriculture, which also clearly appears in the ground for its observance in the Jehovistic Deuteronomy, and that, since the cattle must be fed on the Sabbath, there is no Sunday in the life of shepherds, and none is necessary. But this is certainly no argument against the Mosaic origin of the Sabbath, because the Mosaic legislation was given to a people about to settle in the land of Canaan. But aside from this, the remark of Wellhausen is not important, since the feeding of cattle is not forbidden on the Sabbath, and even during the wandering in the desert the Israelites had other occupations besides the pasturage of cattle. Comp. *e.g.* Ex. xvi. 22 sqq., Num. xv. 32.]

(4) So also the prevailing Jewish interpretation understands the words as כתוב על־העתיד (Rashi *in loco*). An allusion to the Sabbath can only be discovered in Gen. iv. 3 by an incorrect explanation of מִקֵּץ יָמִים.

(5) Justinus Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* cap. 19. 27 ; Irenæus, *Adv. haer.* iv. 16. 2 ; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* i. 4.

(6) Gerhard, *Loc. th. ed. Cott.* v. p. 311, rightly says, *admonemur hac voce, quod ad præceptorum divinorum observantiam requiratur animus* memor *et vigilans.*

(7) So even the Jews themselves regard the Sabbath as an ordinance specifically their own. See Selden, *idem*, iii. 10 ; hence in the synagogue worship the Sabbath is greeted as a bride (comp. Buxtorf, *Synag. jud.* p. 299).

(8) See Baur, *Der hebräische Sabbath und die Nationalfeste des mosaischen Kultus, Tübinger Zeitschr.* 1832, No. 3, p. 125 sq. In modern works, and especially in Oschwald's *Christliche Sonntagsfeier*, 1850, p. 13 sq., a great abuse has been committed in maintaining traditionary positions which cannot be proved. The aim of this work is to obtain an historical foundation for the opinion that the Sabbath was not abrogated with the ceremonial law, by asserting its pre-Mosaic and extra-Mosaic existence. It is worthy of notice how a one-sided Nomism here allies itself with certain hypotheses of the history of religion which subserve a totally different interest. Far more judiciously has the matter in question been treated by Liebetrut in his work *Die Sonntagsfeier das Wochenfest des Volkes Gottes*, 1851.

(9) Comp. Philo, *de mundi opif.* ed. Mang. i. p. 24 ; Plutarch, *de Ei ap. Delph.* cap. 17.

(10) [That the week of seven days, and along with it the presumption of the Sabbath observance, is very ancient, and came from the Babylonians to other nations, appears to be established by Schrader (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1874, pp. 343–353), and is accepted by Riehm and Dillmann as proved.]

(11) Dio Cassius, xxxvii. 18 sq. : "The division of days, according to the seven

so-called planets, began with the Egyptians, and has been, but not, I believe, very long, adopted by all nations. The ancient Greeks, so far as I know, were unacquainted with it. It is now, however, customary among all people, and even among the Romans, and has become to a certain extent indigenous," etc.

(12) See Lepsius, *Chronol. der Aegypter*, i. p. 22. Brugsch in the *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* iii. p. 271.

(13) Especially not among the Egyptians, not even, indeed, according to the passage of Dio Cassius cited above, the subject of which is the merely astrological import of the seven days of the week, and by no means the special sacredness of one of them. Nor among the Arabs; for though, clothed in black, they sacrificed an ox to Saturn on his day in a hexagonal black temple, the reason was not that the seventh day was hallowed by them, but that Saturn was feared as the evil power, the planet Jupiter being also worshipped by them on his day by the sacrifice of a hog (see Stühr, *Religionssyst. des Orients*, p. 407). Nor even among the Greeks; for though Oschwald, *id.* (comp. v. Bohlen, *Altes Indien*, ii. p. 245; Baur, *id.* p. 135 sq.), asserts that in Grecian literature, and even so early as Homer and Hesiod, we meet with decided testimony to the sacredness of the seventh day, this can only refer, so far as a proof of an analogy with the Sabbath is concerned, to those verses quoted by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14; Eusebius, *Præp. ev.* xiii. 12, which are confessedly of Græco-Jewish fabrication. Hesiod himself speaks, *Op. et d.* ver. 770 sq., of the seventh day of the month as sacred to Apollo, and of other days of the month as appropriated to other deities. (See Hermann, *Gottesdienstl. Alterth. der Griechen*, § 44, note 5; Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, p. 430 sqq.) Finally, the Roman calendar had, as is known, absolutely nothing to do with the weekly cycle and the consecration of the seventh day of the week; its feast of Saturn took place but once a year, in December (generally on the 19th), and lasted, after the era of Augustus for three, after that of Caligula for five days. (When seven days were reckoned, as Martial. 14. 72, Lucian. *epist. Saturn.* 25, other festivals were included.)

(14) A combination subsequently adopted by the Rabbins, inasmuch as they call the planet Saturn שַׁבְּתַי.

(15) Comp. Ewald, *Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl.* iii. p. 417.

(16) For a summary of the evidence that the several week-days were called after the planets, see Selden, *idem*, iii. 19.

(17) Dio Cassius alludes to this when he mentions, as a peculiarity of the Jewish Sabbath, the *οὐδὲν τὸ παράπαν ὁρᾶν* (cap. 16), *ἔργου οὐδενὸς σπουδαίου προσάπτεσθαι* (cap. 17).

(18) On the *torpor Saturni*, comp. Servius on Virgil, *Æn.* vi. 714).

(19) Comp. Ovid, *De art. amat.* i. 415 sq.; Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 96–106; Persius, v. 179–184; Martialis, iv. 4, 7. The saying of Tacitus, "*Moses, quo sibi in posterum gentem firmaret*, novos *ritus* contrariosque *ceteris mortalibus indidit*," refers, as appears from the context, among other things to the celebration of the Sabbath.

(20) Josephus, in the frequently misunderstood passage, *c. Ap.* ii. 39, says: "There is no city, whether Greek or barbarian, and no single nation, to which the custom of the seventh day, which we celebrate by intermission of labor, has not penetrated." As appears from the connection of the whole passage, this rhetorical exaggeration by no means speaks of an institution akin to the Sabbath as having existed from of old among the heathen. The passage in Philo (*Vil Mos.* ii. p. 137), when his hyperboles are reduced to their due proportion, testifies to nothing more than Seneca complains of, when, in the well-known words in Augustine, *Civ. dei*, vi. 11 (Seneca, *Opp. ed. Hase*, iii. p. 427), he laments the mimicry of Jewish customs: "*usque eo sceleratissimæ gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit; victi victoribus leges dederunt.*"

(21) Comp. how Tertullian, *Apol.* cap. 16, speaks of heathen *qui diem Saturni otio et victui decernunt, exorbitantes et ipsi a Judaico more, quem ignorant, i.e.* because they are unacquainted with the religious meaning of the Sabbath.

§ 148.

2. *The Idea of the Sabbath.*

In conformity with what has already been advanced, the *meaning* of the Sabbath is to be known from the Old Testament alone. The chief passages relating to it are Gen. ii. 3, Ex. xx. 11, xxxi. 13–17, the essential matter of which is as follows :—God created the world in six days, and rested on the seventh, and therefore blessed and hallowed this day, on which His work was complete. Hence the people whom He has consecrated to Himself, and who acknowledge the Creator and Lord of the world as their God, are also to hallow the seventh day as a day of rest after every six days' labor in the works of their calling, and this is to be a sign of the covenant between God and His people. These propositions contain the following thoughts : 1. Man, like God, is to work and to rest; thus human life is to be a copy of Divine life. But especially must the people who are called to be the instrument of restoring the Divine order in earthly life be seen to be the peculiar possession of the living God, by an alternation of work and rest corresponding with the rhythm of the Divine life. 2. Divine labor terminates in happy rest; not till the Creator rests satisfied in the contemplation of His works is His creation itself complete. So, too, human labor is not to run on in resultless circles, but to terminate in a happy harmony of existence. This thought, as we shall see hereafter (§ 152), is impressed with especial clearness on the institution of the year of jubilee with which the sabbatic seasons close. The idea of the Sabbath, however, extends further. That the whole course of human history is not to run on in dreary endlessness; that its events are to have a positive termination; are to find a completion in an harmonious and God-given order, —is already guaranteed by the Sabbath of creation, and prefigured by the sabbatical seasons. The Divine rest of the seventh day of creation, which has no evening, hovers over the world's progress, that it may at last absorb it into itself. It is upon the very fact that the rest *of God*, the *κατάπαυσις Θεοῦ*, is also to be a rest *for man*, and that God has declared this by the institution of the Sabbath, that Heb. iv. founds a proof for the proposition : *ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ* (ver. 9) (1). This idea of the Sabbath finds its formal expression in the *number seven*, this number frequently appearing in natural occurrences as *ἀριθμὸς τελεσφόρος* and *ἀποκαταστατικός*, as Philo calls it (2). It thus became the sign-manual of the perfection in which the progress of the world was, according to Divine charter, to result, and a special pledge of the perfection of the kingdom of God (3).

The full purport, however, of the idea of the Sabbath is not attained until that dominion of *sin and death*, which have entered into the development of mankind, is taken into account. It was after the curse of God was imposed upon the earth, and man condemned to labor in the sweat of his brow in the service of his perishable existence, that the desire for the rest of God took the form of a longing for *redemption* (Gen. v. 29). Israel, too, learned, by suffering under Egyptian oppression without any refreshing intermission, to sigh for rest. When their God bestowed upon them their regularly recurring period of rest, by leading them out of bondage, this ordinance became at the same time *a thankful solemnity in re-*

membrance of the deliverance they had experienced. Hence it is said, in the second version of the Decalogue (Deut. v. 15): "Remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, with a mighty hand and a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." This passage does not, as it has often been understood, merely urge a motive for the special duty of not hindering servants from resting on the seventh day; nor, on the other hand, does it contain, as has also been asserted, the proper objective reason for the sanctification of the Sabbath, which is, on the contrary, expressed, as already said, in the first version of the Decalogue, Ex. xx. 11; but it applies to the keeping of the Sabbath, in particular, that consideration which is the deepest subjective incitement to the fulfilling of the whole law (4). How closely the remembrance of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage was bound up with this very institution of the Sabbath, is evident from what, according to the testimony of Roman authors given above (Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 4; Justin, *Hist.* 36. 2), was known to the heathen concerning the reason for the celebration of the Sabbath.

We have thus explained how the Sabbath teaches to look *upward*, *onward*, and *backward;* but one point, important in an ethical aspect, remains to be noticed. The Sabbath has its significance only as the seventh day, preceded by six days of labor. The first part of the command, Ex. xx. 9, to hallow the Sabbath, is itself equally a command: "Six days shalt thou labor and do all that thou hast to do, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God" (5). Thus it is only upon the *foundation of preceding labor in our vocation* that the rest of the Sabbath is to be reared. The saying, Gen. iii. 19, "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread," remains in force. The Sabbath is only intended to prevent self-exhaustion in earthly labor (6), and to sanctify the works of our calling by the end toward which they tend. The humane character of the Mosaic law which is stamped upon the ordinance of the Sabbath, especially in the benefits it confers upon menials, the strangers dwelling in the midst of Israel, and the beasts of draught and burden (Ex. xx. 10, xxiii. 12), and the *civil and social* advantages it brings, cannot be further dwelt on here (7).

(1) This, as is well known, was further explained by the ancient Church of the seventh of the seven thousand years during which the world was to continue its course, and which was to be its sabbatical consummation (see especially Lactantius, *Inst.* vii. 14).

(2) Comp. Baur, *id.*, and Philo, *de mundi opif.* M. i. p. 24, *de septenario*, M. ii. p. 281. Philo's mysticism of numbers is founded upon the circumstance that seven is that number in the decade which is not produced, and which, within the decade, does not produce. Thus seven becomes the symbol of the immutable, the complete. However little weight we may attribute to this, it is at all events remarkable that a certain importance of the number seven glimmers through, in one way or other, in every one of the more developed religions of antiquity.

(3) The view brought forward, chiefly by Bähr (*Symbolik des mos. Kultus*, i. p. 187), that three is the signature of the Godhead, four that of the world, seven as the number in which three and four meet and combine in one number, *the signature of the connection of God and the world*, is not tenable. Comp. on this point, besides what is quoted § 145, note 1, Lämmert, *Zur Revision der biblischen Zahlensymbolik*, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1864, No. 1. He says, p. 7: "As often as seven recurs in the enumeration of sections of time, there is a period of sacred rest, a time of

the Lord, when earthly work is laid aside,—a type of the consummation which will take place in *that* sabbatic rest which remaineth to the people of God.

(4) Deut. v. 15 bears the same relation to Ex. xx. 11 as does *e.g.* Deut. xxvi. 8 sq. to previous laws concerning the offering of the first-fruits. [This view of the passage is not accepted by Riehm (p. 1310) and Dillmann (p. 216) who regard it as expressing the thought that Israel, as Jehovah's property by deliverance from Egypt, is bound to observe the Sabbath.]

(5) It is not correct to say, with Hengstenberg, that the chief matter with respect to the Sabbath is not that it is exactly the seventh day, but that it is the weekly recurring rest day of the people. The sabbatical seasons are closing periods. The idea of Sunday is quite different.

(6) Keil, *Bibl. Archäol.* i. p. 362 : "As a corrective of the injury arising from that severe and burdensome labor, the result of the curse, which tends to alienate man from God."

(7) It was remarked, § 12, what good service has been done in these respects, especially by J. D. Michaelis. The Old Testament sabbatic ordinances have in this respect found an eloquent eulogist in Proudhon, the communist (*Die Sonntagsfeier, betrachtet in Hinsicht auf öffentliche Gesundheit, Moral, Familien- und Bürgerleben*; aus dem Französischen, Ratibor, 1850). The bringing forward of such utilitarian considerations is not on the whole unjustifiable, if they are stated as merely secondary, and are deduced without violence from the principle; but only total misconception or gross perversion of the ideal import of the Mosaic law can characterize them as the proper explanation of the Mosaic ordinances.

§ 149.

3. *The Celebration of the Sabbath.*

According to the foregoing remarks, the Sabbath is a Divine *institution*, or, to speak more correctly, a *gift of Divine grace* for the sanctification of the people (Ezek. xx. 12) (1). In other words, the Sabbath is first of all of a *sacramental* nature. To the Divine gift the *conduct* or devotion of the people which God requires must correspond, and thus a *sacrificial* is added to the sacramental element. If the sacrificial, however, is placed in the foreground, as by Ewald (*Antiquities*, p. 110 sqq.), who views the Sabbath as a sacrifice of rest, or if the sabbatical abstinence from labor is, as a cessation from business and a renunciation of gain, even placed on a level with fasting, as by Knobel (on Lev. xxiii.), we have in either case a thorough misconception of the Old Testament view (2). In the Old Testament, the Sabbath, so far from presenting any painful aspect of renunciation, is regarded as a delight (Isa. lviii. 13), *a day of joy* (compare the song for the Sabbath, Ps. xcii. and Hos. ii. 13) (3).

It is in this sense that we must regard the enactments with respect to the *celebration* of the Sabbath. The first point is *the resting from labor*, to which belongs not merely the intermission of servile work (field work even in the seasons of ploughing and harvest, Ex. xxxiv. 21 ; gathering wood, Num. xv. 32), but also, Ex. xvi. 23, omission of the preparation of food,—the prohibition to kindle fire in their dwellings, xxxv. 3, referring without doubt to the latter. The Israelites were also forbidden to go out of the camp, xvi. 19, on the Sabbath, whence the prohibition of travelling on that day subsequently arose. Capital punishment, xxxi. 14, xxxv. 2, viz. by stoning, Num. xv. 35 sq., was attached to the transgression of these enactments, as it was to that of all the fundamental laws of the theocracy. It was quite in harmony with these appointments of the law, that the

bearing of burdens, Jer. xvii. 21, and trading, Amos xiii. 5 sq., were declared incompatible with the Sabbath, and that Nehemiah ordered a barring of the gates, Neh. xiii. 15, 19, to prevent the trading whose discontinuance had, according to x. 31, been promised. The *positive* celebration of the Sabbath arose from its *appointment for worship*. Besides the consecration it received from the doubling of the morning and evening sacrifices (Num. xxviii. 9), and the renewal of the shewbread (Lev. xxiv. 8), a holy convocation, מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ, also took place on this day (see § 146. 3). As it was possible for only a small portion of the people to visit the central sanctuary, meetings for hearing and meditating on the Divine word may have taken place in very early times, but the first trace of such assemblies is found in 2 Kings iv. 23. Greater prominence is unmistakably given in the law to the negative than to the positive side of Sabbath sanctification; and it is totally incorrect to assert with Hengstenberg that the cessation from labor enjoined on the Sabbath was merely a *means*, the end being public worship. It is worthy of remark that the later prophetic passages which insist on the sanctification of the Sabbath, such as Isa. lvi. 2, lviii. 13 sq., Jer. xvii. 21 sqq., confine themselves to declaring what ought *not* to be done on the Sabbath; Isa. lviii. 13 even forbids unprofitable idleness and empty talk. Are we then to conclude that that positive sanctification of the Sabbath, which consists in public worship, was less intended by the law? Such a notion is opposed by the whole development of the Sabbath idea just described. We must rather recognize here that wise tuition of the law, which does not expressly command much, because it leaves much to be the spontaneous result of the given facts, types, and ordinances (comp. § 84). Such a process, from negative to positive, from the external to the internal, was latent in the legal prescriptions concerning the rest of the Sabbath. Besides insuring that recreation which is, as we have said, their proper aim, they go as far as is needful in preparing the ground for a positive sanctification of the day, the motives for which are thus implanted in the nation's heart (4); while the enactments, on the contrary, with which the later Judaism encompassed the command concerning the Sabbath, were wholly adapted to repress a cheerful observance of the day (5).

(1) Ezek. xx. 12: "I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that it might be known that I, Jehovah, sanctify them."

(2) [Dillmann's view (p. 215 sq.) is similar to that of Ewald. According to Lemme (*Die religionsgeschichtiche Bedeutung des Dekalogs*, p. 59 sqq.) the inactivity of the Sabbath rest is the expression of dependence upon God. "Since a false activity, in a pretended influence upon the Deity, is excluded (this is to Him the fundamental thought of the previous commandments of the decalogue), inactivity becomes parallel to the thought of the right dependence upon God."]

(3) At their first celebration of the Sabbath, the people received a substantial pledge of the blessing with which its faithful observance would be rewarded, and of the bountiful compensation contemplated for what was lost by cessation from labor (Ex. xvi. 29).

(4) Comp. Vitringa, *De Synag. vet.*, p. 295 f.

(5) These enactments were made in the centuries between Ezra and Christ. On the importance attached during the captivity to the ordinance of the Sabbath as one of those portions of the ceremonial law which could be practised by the Jews scattered among the heathen, comp. *Prophetism*. The above-quoted passages, however, of the book of Nehemiah, especially x. 31, according to which the people had to bind themselves by oath to give up trading on the Sabbath, show

that at that time a strict observance of the Sabbath had not yet become a custom of the people. There is, however, in the measures taken by Nehemiah for the preservation of the sabbatic rest, nothing of the microscopic casuistry of after times. On the scrupulousness with which the Sabbath was observed in the times of the Maccabees, see the above-cited article, p. 290, where will also be found, p. 201 sqq., a collection of the most important prescriptions of the later Judaism.

(*b*) THE NEW MOON SABBATH.

§ 150.

By the term *new moon*, according to the sense in which the law uses it, we must undoubtedly understand, not the astronomical new moon, but the *first appearance of the moon's sickle*, which was thus designated by other ancient nations also, and certainly by the later Jews (1). The ordinary new moons were only subordinate festivals, on which (Num. xxviii. 11–15) an increased burnt-offering was offered, accompanied, as appears from x. 10, by a blowing of trumpets. They were chiefly used, as may be conjectured from 1 Sam. xx. 5 sq., for family sacrifices. Labor was not forbidden on these days ; but in later times, as may be inferred from Amos viii. 5, a stricter observance seems to have been enacted, at least in the kingdom of the ten tribes.—The *seventh new moon*, viz. that of the month Tisri in the autumn, on the contrary, was a sabbatical day. Its proper name, יוֹם תְּרוּעָה, the day of trumpet-sounding, seems to indicate that the use of trumpets in public worship took place with special solemnity on this day. *The meaning of the blowing of trumpets* is evident from Num. x. 9 sq. : "If ye go to war, . . . ye shall blow an alarm with the trumpets, and ye shall be remembered before the Lord. . . . Also in the days of your gladness, your solemn days or new moons, ye shall blow with trumpets at your burnt-offerings and at your peace-offerings, for a memorial before your God" (לְזִכָּרוֹן לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהֵיכֶם). According to this, the sounding of trumpets at worship took the place, as it were, of an invocation : it was to bring the people to God's remembrance, or rather to bring the people to the consciousness that God was thinking of them. Hence we subsequently find that, when after the time of David singing was introduced into public worship, the intervention of trumpet-sounding by the priests at specially marked passages helped, so to speak, to bear the supplications of the people upward to the Lord (comp. 2 Chron. xiii.14) (2). Whether, however, the sounding of trumpets at the seventh new moon was meant to indicate in a general manner that this was an intensified Sabbath, or whether (as Sommer thinks) this act had a reference to the Day of Atonement which closely followed, and was intended, as it were, to remind God of the approaching act of grace, of the renewed forgiveness of the sins of the people, cannot be determined. —The *feast of the new year* (3) was not yet a day celebrated in the Mosaic worship, though the precept, Ex. xii. 2, that the month in which Israel departed from Egypt (that of Abib or Nisan in the spring) was to be the first month of the year, seems to indicate that the year had previously commenced at another period (4) ; and passages such as Ex. xxiii. 16 presuppose an agricultural year beginning in the autumn, which probably, however, had no appointed boundaries (5).

(1) On the approach of the new moon, the Sanhedrim assembled at Jerusalem

to receive from him who had first seen the sickle of the moon, the information, which was then transmitted by signals throughout the country.

(2) To this I refer, with Sommer (comp. his *Bibl. Abhandl.* i. p. 37 sq.), Keil, and others, the difficult *Selah.*

(3) [Wellhausen maintains (i. 111 sq.) that the day was the ecclesiastical new year in the priests' codex; that it survived from an earlier period, as the civil new year also was originally in the autumn; that the transfer of the beginning of the year to the spring (Abib or Nisan) was subsequently made under Babylonian influence; and that this later change of the calendar is evident in the priests' codex from the fact that it designates the old New Year's day as the first day of the seventh month. Now, if this were correct, we should have clear evidence of the late composition of the priests' codex. But from the fact that, according to Lev. xxx. 9 sq., the trumpets were blown at the beginning of the year of jubilee on the 10th of Tisri (comp. on the meaning of this blowing of trumpets, § 152), it does not follow that the new moon of Tisri was thereby characterized as the *ecclesiastical* New Year's day, nor even as a New Year's day at all. On the other hand, that the reckoning according to the spring season rested upon *late* Babylonian influence, comp. Dillmann, p. 102 sq.]

(4) Comp. also what is said on the narrative of the deluge in the commentaries on Genesis of Knobel, p. 74, and Delitzsch, ed. 2, p. 250 sq., ed. 4, p. 213 sq.

(5) See also Ex. xxxiv. 22, and finally the appointment concerning the commencement of the year of jubilee, Lev. xxv. 9, together with the fact that the sabbatical year must also naturally have begun at seed-time, *i.e.* in harvest (comp. xxv. 4). According to Josephus, *Ant.* i. 3. 3, the beginning of the year with Tisri was of pre-Mosaic institution; and this date was preserved by Moses for the transaction of civil business. But whatever might have been the case with regard to the pre-Mosaic year, the above-quoted passages from the middle books of the Pentateuch do not point to the 1st Tisri as the beginning of the civil year. For it is unnatural to suppose that, on the assumption of such a date of commencement, it could be said of the Feast of Tabernacles, which was celebrated from the 15th to the 21st Tisri, that it fell in the end of the year; nor are the remarks of Hupfeld (*De primitiva et vera temp. fest. ap. Hebr. ratione*, ii. p. 14), in favor of such a view, of much avail. Far preferable is the view of Hitzig (*Komm. zu Jesaja*, p. 335), that if the beginning of the agricultural year (for the so-called civil year is more correctly designated thus) was bound to an appointed day, still for ordinary affairs the commencement of the year dated from the close of the Feast of Tabernacles. On the question how the new moon Sabbath became the civil new year's festival, as it still is among the Jews, see the history of the post-Babylonian period.

(*c*) THE SABBATICAL YEAR AND THE YEAR OF JUBILEE (1).

§ 151.

Legal Enactments.

The institutions of the *sabbatical year* and the *year of jubilee*, with which the cycle of sabbatic seasons closed, are so closely connected, that it will be convenient to consider them together. The laws relating to the *sabbatical year* are as follow:—*First*, the general command, Ex. xxiii. 10 sq., that after the land had been sown and its harvests gathered during six successive years, it should rest and lie still (תִּשְׁמְטֶנָּה) (2), that *the poor* might eat of it, and that what they left the beasts of the field might eat. In like manner, too, were the vineyards and olive-yards to be dealt with. *Care for the poor* is, as the connection with what precedes shows (3), the point of view under which the sabbatical year is here chiefly regarded. The *second* and more detailed law, Lev. xxv. 1–7, more pre-

cisely designates this ordinance as a rest of the *land* (vers. 2, 4) unto Jehovah, calls the year a sabbath year (שְׁנַת שַׁבָּתוֹן), and further directs that what the fields and vineyards produce in this year without cultivation shall not be stored up, but consumed by the owner, his family, his day laborers, and the strangers sojourning with him; his cattle, and the wild animals of the land (4). The point of view here taken is that the produce of the sabbatic year is to be *common property* for man and beast (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 12. 3),—a point of view which does not exclude but includes that brought forward in the first law. With the great fertility of the soil of Palestine, which is still apparent (5) in its self-sown, wild-growing wheat, the growth (סָפִיחַ) from the fallen seeds of the preceding year might yield a not inconsiderable crop (6). An essentially new enactment is contained in the *third* law, Deut. xv. 1–11. The connection of 1–6 with xiv. 29, and with what follows in xv. 7–10, recalls the connection of the first law in the book of the covenant, the question being here, as there, the special import of the sabbatical year to *the poor*. For in the seventh year every creditor was to release (שָׁמַט) the loan he had lent to his neighbor (7). Of his neighbor or of his brother, in contradistinction to a foreigner, ver. 5, he was not to exact, because a release (שְׁמִטָּה) had been proclaimed, to the honor of the Lord; whence the sabbath year is also called, ver. 9 (comp. xxxi. 10), שְׁנַת הַשְּׁמִטָּה, the year of release. The question whether by release we are to understand a final remission or a temporary suspension, has been variously answered. The former is the ordinary Jewish view (8), though expedients were subsequently found for evading the command (9). Many Christian theologians have also shared in the Rabbinic view, especially Luther. The expressions, however, in vers. 2 and 3 go no further than to say that debts are not to be exacted, and therefore point merely to their suspension (10). The *fourth* law respecting the sabbath year, Deut. xxxi. 10–13, enjoins that at the Feast of Tabernacles in the year of release, the law shall be read in the public assembly of the people in the sanctuary. The sabbath year being regulated by agriculture, and beginning with the omission of sowing in autumn, or being more definitely connected with a certain day, as the year of jubilee was with the 10th Tisri (11), this Feast of Tabernacles would occur at its commencement (12). Hence a significant hint is given by this precept as to how the seventh year just entered upon ought to be hallowed.

Seven such sabbatic years terminated with *the year of jubilee* (שְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל). With respect to this it is said, Lev. xxv. 8, 10: "Seven sabbaths of years shalt thou number, seven years seven times, that the days of the seven sabbaths of years may be forty-nine years. . . . And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year." This very variously-explained passage is most naturally understood as declaring that the year of jubilee is to follow the seventh sabbatical year,—not, indeed (as some have considered), as the first year of a new period of sabbatical years, but so that the new period should not commence till the fifty-first year. This view of the matter appears to be assumed by both Philo and Josephus (13). And thus also does the controverted passage xxv. 20–22, which then refers to the year of jubilee spoken of immediately before, and assumes two consecutive fallow years, find its most natural explanation. According to another view, the year of jubilee was, on the contrary, the forty-ninth, and, as the sabbath of sabbath years, coincided

with every seventh of the latter (14). It is thus generally assumed that the sabbatical year began in the spring; and the designation of the year of jubilee as the fiftieth is explained by saying that the latter, not commencing till harvest, was composed of the second half of the seventh year and the first half of the first year of a new sabbatical period. This latter theory cannot appeal with certainty to Jewish tradition. For the view of R. Jehuda (*Erachin*, fol. 12 *b*), that the year of jubilee as a whole was never reckoned as a separate year, is an isolated one,—the tradition of the Geonim (in Maimonides, *de juribus anni septimi et jubilæi*, x. 4) only asserting that the year of jubilee fell into desuetude after the destruction of the first temple.

According to Lev. xxv. 9, the year of jubilee was to be proclaimed by the sound of a trumpet (שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה) throughout the whole land (by means of messengers), on the tenth day of the seventh month, that is, on the Day of Atonement, after all the transgressions resting upon the people had been expiated. It was from the sound of this trumpet (Raschi, על שם תקיעת שופר) that the year, according to the most widely-accepted view, took its name. In this case יוֹבֵל must probably be explained as derived from יָבַל to flow abundantly, and used to designate the sound flowing or bursting forth from the trumpet,—a sense which well agrees with the expression מָשַׁךְ הַיּוֹבֵל, Ex. xix. 13, and מָשַׁךְ בְּקֶרֶן הַיּוֹבֵל, Josh. vi. 5. Others regard it as an onomatopoetic word, in the sense of *jubilavit* (comp. Gesenius, *Thes.* ii. p. 561); thus the Vulgate renders: *Annus jubilei* or *jubileus*. On the other hand, a Rabbinic tradition (see Aben Ezra on Lev. xxv. 10) makes יוֹבֵל = שָׁלוּחַ, *emissus*, and designate a ram, and then a ram's horn. This explanation is in any case incorrect, while the grammatical notion on which it is founded is, on the contrary, admissible. יוֹבֵל would then, with דְּרוֹר, *free course*, denote first him who is free to go where he will, and then attain the abstract meaning of דְּרוֹר itself (see Hitzig on Jer. xxxiv. 8), which agrees well with Lev. xxv. 10 (15).

With regard to the *celebration* of the year of jubilee, we notice first the feature which it had in common with the sabbatical year, *as a cessation from agricultural labor*, Lev. xxv. 11 sq. The produce of what grew of itself was not to be stored up, but brought in from the field as required for use (16). The feature peculiar to the year of jubilee is contained, ver. 10, in the words, "Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim *liberty* (דְּרוֹר) throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you, that ye may *return every man to his possession, and every man to his family.*" In this year, called hence, Ez. xlvi. 17, שְׁנַת דְּרוֹר (which may be briefly translated, as by Luther, the *free year* [A.V. the *year of liberty*]), there took place, as it were, a new birth of the state, at which all such civil impediments as were opposed to theocratic principles were abolished. One of these was the bondage of Israelitish citizens (17). Hence according to ver. 39 of the law in Lev. xxv., every Israelite who had sold himself on account of his poverty was to be freed (comp. § 110). Another consisted in the alienation of hereditary estates, which might not therefore extend beyond the year of jubilee, in which all property was to return without compensation to the family to whom it originally belonged (*i.e.* to the original possessors, if still alive, or to their heirs), Lev. xxv. 23 sq. Houses in unwalled villages were (ver. 31)

treated in the same manner as landed property, while houses in walled towns, on the contrary, if unredeemed during the year of respite after their sale, remained the property of their purchasers, the year of jubilee making no alteration in this respect, ver. 29 sq. The reason for this distinction is easily perceived. Houses of the former kind were closely connected with landed property (ver. 13, they shall be counted to the field of the country), while houses in towns, on the other hand, stood in no relation to the land, and hence, as mere human works and property, were not equally under the sovereignty of Jehovah as Lord of the land. [Yet the houses of the Levites in the cities assigned to them formed an exception. As a possession belonging to them in virtue of a divine ordinance, they were to be dealt with exactly as the inheritances of the other tribes.]

(1) Comp. Hupfeld, *De primitiva et vera temp. fest. ap. Hebr. ratione*, iii. Hal. 1858, and my article on the sabbatical and jubilee years in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xiii. p. 204 sq. [also Riehm's art "Jobeljahr" and "Sabbathjahr" in his *Handwörterbuch*]. A list of the numerous monographs on this subject is given by Winer in the *Bibl. Realwörterbuch* under the articles *Sabbath Year* and *Year of Jubilee*. The chief works of later date are Hug's essay, "Ueber das mosaische Gesetz vom Jubeljahr" in the *Zeitschr. für das Erzbisthum Freiburg*, i. 1, and the prize essays at the Jubilee of the Göttingen University, 1837, *de anno Hebræorum jubilæo*, by Kranald and Wolde ; comp. Ewald's notice of the latter in the *Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl.* i. p. 410 sq.

(2) In opposition to the usual explanation, Hupfeld (*id.* p. 10) thinks that the suffix in תִּשְׁבָּתָה וְנָטְשָׁתָּה refers not to אֶרֶץ but to תְּבוּאָתָהּ, and understands ver. 11 as inculcating not an omission of cultivation, but only a setting free of the produce. But even granting this certainly admissible construction, it is by no means justifiable to understand ver. 11 as though it said : In the seventh year thou shalt *indeed also sow* thy land, but leave its produce free. Ἄτοπον γὰρ ἦν, ἑτέρους μὲν πονεῖν, ἑτέρους δὲ καρποῦσθαι, as Philo (*de carit.* ii. p. 391) rightly remarks. On the contrary, ver. 11, according to its evident meaning, forms a contrast to the whole preceding verse. [Wellhausen and Riehm understand the law as not here prescribing for the whole nation a common sabbath year in which the entire harvest was to be relinquished, but rather that every individual proprietor was to use his right of cultivating any piece of ground only six years, and in the seventh year should give up the harvest of the cultivated piece, or, according to Riehm, should leave the ground fallow. Dillmann decides, referring to the analogy of v. 12, in favor of the ordinary view, viz. that a common sabbatical year was prescribed.]

(3) Compare Ranke, *Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, ii. p. 53.

(4) The meaning of this appointment is not at all, as Hupfeld, *id.* p. 13, understands it, that the produce of the sabbath year is to serve for the nourishment of the family to the *exclusion* of the poor ; for hired servants and strangers did not (as is evident from Ex. xii. 45) belong to the family, and both classes, having no possessions of land in the country, are just those who must, on the contrary, be reckoned among the poor of the land (comp. Deut. xxiv. 14).

(5) See the information given on this point in Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xvi. pp. 283, 482, 693.

(6) Still the meaning of the law is not that this wild growth would suffice for the nourishment of the year ; Lev. xxv. 20–22, on the contrary, assumes that the stores of former years were available.

(7) Or, if with Hupfeld, *id.* p. 21, we read מַשֵּׁה in ver. 2, and make יָדוֹ dependent on שָׁמוֹט, every creditor shall let his hand rest with respect to that which he hath lent to his neighbor.

(8) A view which is probably to be regarded as that of the LXX, who translate ἀφήσεις πᾶν χρέος . . . καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν σου οὐκ ἀπαιτήσεις, which is then found in

Philo, who, *de septen.* ed. M. ii. p. 277, designates the matter by *τὰ δάνεια χαρίζεσθαι*, and, p. 284, by *χρεωκοπία*, and is finally expressed in *Mishna Shebiith*, x. 1.

(9) According to the Mishna, *id.* § 8, the law was complied with if the creditor merely *promised* to remit the debt, and then, if the debtor insisted on making payment, received it as a gift,—a gift, that is, which the Gemara defines as one to which the debtor was previously pledged. For other expedients provided in the Mishna for lightening the burden entailed by this command, especially the so-called *Prosbul*, see the article quoted, p. 206. See also on this subject Geiger's *Lesestücke aus der Mischna*, pp. 4, 77 sq., and Saalschütz's *Mos. Recht*, p. 164, note 208.

(10) We cannot see that this is opposed, as has been asserted, to ver. 9, for the consideration that money lent could not be called in during the sabbath year might well give rise to the refusal of loans during the period immediately preceding it. The command in respect to debts has been frequently so combined with the law for letting the land lie fallow, as to represent the former as arising from a regard to the incapacity incurred by the debtor through his loss of the regular harvest. This combination cannot be entirely rejected, though the special motive for the law is a deeper one, as will be further shown in the subsequent discussion of the idea of the sabbatic year. It is generally acknowledged that the law for the emancipation of Hebrew bondmen and bondmaidens in the seventh year of their bondage, which immediately follows the law in respect to debts, Deut. xv. 12–18, has no reference to the sabbatical year. This is evident even from ver. 14, which enjoins that the freed bondman shall be furnished out of the floor and out of the wine-press,—an injunction presupposing a regular harvest.

(11) According to the view of most Rabbins, even of Maimonides (*de juribus anni septimi et jubilæi*, vi. 6), both the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee began on the first of Tisri. The time, however, at which the Jewish year subsequently commenced, certainly gave rise to this view. There is no reason whatever for altering, with Hupfeld, בֶּעָשׂוֹר of Lev. xxv. 9 into בֶּאֶחָד. Gusset, *Comment. ling. hebr. s.v.* שָׁמַט, defends the view which makes the sabbath year begin with the 1st Nisan. A comparison of the different views on this point is given by Majus, *Dissert. de jure anni septimi*, p. 19.

(12) מִקֵּץ שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים, in Deut. xxxi. 10, does not mean "at the end of the seventh year," or even "after its expiration," *i.e.*, at the beginning of the eighth, as *M. Sota*, vii. 8, understands the passage, but, like xv. 1, "at the end of a seven-years period," *i.e.* in the seventh year, generally speaking; comp. xxv. 18 with xxvi. 12.

(13) Philo, who frequently mentions the year of jubilee, always calls it the fiftieth; and Josephus expressly says, *Ant.* iii. 12. 3, that the lawgiver commanded to do the same as is done in the sabbath year, *μεθ' ἑβδόμην ἐτῶν ἑβδομάδα. Ταῦτα πεντήκοντα μέν ἐστιν ἔτη τὰ πάντα, καλεῖται δὲ ὑπὸ Ἑβραίων ὁ πεντηκοστὸς ἐνιαυτὸς Ἰώβηλος.*

(14) So Gatterer, Frank, and other older chronologists (comp. Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, i. p. 504; also Gusset, *id.*); and among moderns, especially Ewald, *Antiquities of the People of Israel*, p. 375.

(15) So the LXX: *ἐνιαυτὸς ἀφέσεως*: Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 12. 3: *ἐλευθερίαν σημαίνει τὸ ὄνομα.* On other explanations of the expression, see Majus on Maimonides, *de juribus, etc.*, p. 120 sq.; Carpzov, *App. ant.* p. 447 sq.

(16) Lev. xxv. 11: "Ye shall not sow, neither reap its (the land's) self-growth, nor gather its unpruned vine: for it is the jubilee; it shall be holy unto you: ye shall eat its increase out of the field." Even Isa. xxxvii. 30, in which a prospect of nourishment from what grew of itself, even in the second year, is held out to the people, because agriculture could not be pursued, is sufficient to remove any doubt as to whether the soil would yield crops worth speaking of in a second fallow year. The fertility of Palestine was certainly not less than that of Albania, where, according to Strabo, xi. 4. 3, one sowing yielded from two to three crops.

(17) This was opposed to the Lord's exclusive proprietorship of His redeemed people. Lev. xxv. 42: "For they are my servants, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen.

§ 152.

Import and Practicability of the Institutions of the Sabbatical Year and the Year of Jubilee.

The *meaning* of these two institutions has been chiefly deduced from their value in a merely political and agricultural point of view (1). Thus J. D. Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, i. art. 74) seeks, in his usual manner, to show that the sabbatical year was intended to oblige the people to lay by during productive years, as the best means of preventing dearth. Others have regarded the manuring of the fields by the cattle, who were allowed to be turned loose in them, and others still, who are the majority, the enhancement of the fertility of the soil by leaving it fallow, with the consequent promotion of the chase, as its main design,—others again regard it as unreasonable to allow the land to lie fallow two successive years. But of all this the law says not a word: it simply refers (Lev. xxv. 21 sq.) to the Divine blessing with which obedience was to be rewarded (2). With far greater discrimination than is manifested in the suggestion of such utilitarian considerations, Ewald recurs to that feeling for nature prevailing among the ancients, which assigned to the soil a Divine right to rest and forbearance (3). But this, too, fails to reach the true point of view clearly expressed, Lev. xxv. 2, in the words, "The land shall keep a sabbath *unto the Lord.*" It is upon the thought that man, acknowledging in act God's higher right of property ("the land is mine," ver. 23), should withhold his hand from cultivating the land, and place it wholly at the Lord's disposal for His blessing, that the whole ordinance is founded (4). It is at the same time the payment of a debt on the part of the land to Jehovah (comp. Lev. xxvi. 34; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21). Israel was thus taught, as Keil (*Archäologie*, i. p. 373) aptly remarks, that "the earth, though made for man, was yet not made merely that he might possess himself of its increase, but that it might be holy to the Lord, and also partake of His blessed rest." Thus the *sabbath year* is in a certain sense a return to the condition existing before the words (Gen. iii. 17), "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life," were uttered (5). Equally, too, does the sabbath year typically point to the time when creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption (Rom. viii. 21). Besides, the increase wherewith God blessed the earth in the sabbath year being common to all, whether man or beast, and especially designed for the benefit of the poor, a check was thus put upon a selfish estimation of the rights of property, and the remembrance fostered that the Lord, upon whom the eyes of all wait that He may give them their meat in due season (Ps. civ. 27), would have every living thing satisfied with His gifts (Ps. cxlv. 16) (6). Finally, that the poor might really enjoy life, they were to be released from pressure on the part of their creditors (7).

The year of jubilee, by which the sabbatic cycle was completed, while involving the idea of the sabbath year, has, moreover, its own specific import in the idea of *release*, and of the reinstatement of the theocracy in its original and divinely ap-

pointed order, in which all were, as the servants of God, to be free, and each was to be assured of his earthly maintenance, by being restored to the enjoyment of the inheritance allotted to his family for this purpose. The God who once redeemed His people from Egypt, and acquired them as His possession, here appears again as a redeemer (גֹּאֵל), to restore to the bondman his personal freedom, and to re-endow the poor with the share allotted him in the inheritance of his people. For among the covenant people no poor should properly have been found (Deut. xv. 4); and the fruit of a consistent carrying out of the law of the year of jubilee would at least have been that a proletariat could not have been found in Israel. Before such a year of grace, however, could appear, transgressions must have been pardoned; hence the year of jubilee was to be proclaimed on the *Day of Atonement* (see Keil, *id.* p. 379). The *sound of the trumpet*, as it once proclaimed on Sinai the descent of the Lord for the promulgation of the law, was now to announce His gracious presence, and at the same time to serve as a summons to the congregation.—In the prophecy, Isa. lxi. 1–3, the year of jubilee is as the year of ἀποκατάστασις regarded as typical of the times of the Messiah, in which the discords of the world's history are to be resolved into the harmony of the Divine life. And hence Christ designates Himself as the fulfiller of this prophecy (Luke iv. 21); while Heb. iv. 9, by calling the perfected kingdom of God the σαββατισμός of the people of God, also refers to the type of the year of jubilee.

We proceed to inquire into the *practicability of the institutions of the jubilee and the sabbatical year*. The difficulties [of observing them] are so evident, that for this very reason it is impossible to explain the whole system as an outgrowth from subsequent relations, rather than as purely a result of the theocratic principle (8). Still the system was by no means absolutely impracticable, if the people were willing to sacrifice all selfish considerations to the Divine will. The omission of these ordinances was, however, already contemplated in Lev. xxvi. 35, while how far they were really carried into practice in post-Mosaic times does not appear. It is evident from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, where it is said that the land lay desolate during the captivity seventy years to make up for its sabbath years, that the celebration of the sabbatical year had been omitted during the last centuries before the captivity. If the number is taken exactly, the passage points to an omission of the sabbath year reaching back about 500 years, *i.e.* to the days of Solomon (9). Scarcely any traces of the year of jubilee, during the time preceding the captivity, are found in the Old Testament, and these in passages of doubtful interpretation; the most probable is in Isa. xxxvii. 30. Whether the chronological statement in Ezek. i. 1 ("in the thirtieth year") means the thirtieth year of a jubilee period (see Hitzig *in loc.* and on xl. 1) is very uncertain; while in Ezek. vii. 12, on the contrary, we at all events meet with a reference to the ordinance of the jubilee, and in the prophetic legislation in Ezekiel the institution is certainly presupposed. The year of liberty mentioned Jer. xxxiv. 8–10, is not a year of jubilee. The release of the servants was appointed merely with reference to Ex. xxi. 2, Deut. xv. 12 sqq., the occasion perhaps being (see Hitzig *in loc.*) the occurrence of a sabbath year. The legal principle, on the contrary, for the preservation of which the year of jubilee was appointed, viz. that every family should retain its inheritance, had struck deep root in the nation. Comp. the narrative (1 Kings xxi. 3 sq.) of Naboth. Prophetic rebukes, too, like Jer.

v. 8 sq. and Mic. ii. 2, etc., can only be fully understood from this point of view; while these very passages lead to the conclusion that a carrying out of the law of the jubilee was out of the question. *After the captivity*, the people, under the influence of Nehemiah, bound themselves to the observance of the sabbatical years (Neh. x. 32), which, being frequently mentioned by Josephus (10), must have been henceforth the general practice. The laws specially relating to the year of jubilee were, on the contrary, never revived, though they may have exercised an influence on particular civil enactments (11). The ordinance of the sabbath year, later enactments concerning which are collected in *Mishna Shebiith*, was regarded as confined to the Holy Land, because it is said, Lev. xxv. 2, "When ye be come into the land," etc., (12). There was no sabbath year for any country beyond Palestine, though certain restrictions prevailed with respect to Syria, on account of its near relation to Palestine (13).

(1) What has already been said in our discussion of the Sabbath (§ 148, note 7) concerning such explanations, is generally applicable to these views. On the far-fetched hypothesis of Hug, *id.* p. 10 sqq., see the article quoted, p. 210.

(2) Speaking on this point, Schnell (*Das israel. Recht*, p. 28) very justly remarks: "Much has been at different times said of the agricultural and political advantages of this institution. Moses, however, does not seem to have expected much from the prospect of such advantages, but rather to have anticipated the opposition of the ordinary mind, which was as active in his days as in ours, for here again he simply refers the people to the old fundamental thought of the whole sabbatical system, viz. the *Divine blessing*."

(3) See Ewald, *Antiquities*, p. 370 f.: "The soil, too, has its Divine right to a necessary and therefore a Divine measure of rest and forbearance; nor must man be always exercising upon it his desire to labor and acquire. The soil yields its produce yearly, like a debt which it discharges to man, and upon which he may calculate as the reward of the labor he has bestowed upon it; but just as we cannot be at all times demanding payment from a human creditor, so must the land be left free at the proper season, without its debt being exacted from it." There is assuredly a certain ethical relation between an estate and its owner; hence the poet, Job xxxi. 38 sq., makes the land which had been torn from its lord cry out, and its furrows weep, because they do not bring forth for their lawful owner. How, then, should not the owner, on the other hand, have compassion on his land! [This rhetorical conception cannot be regarded as having any solid basis.—D.]

(4) The notion that an estate dedicated to the Deity was to remain unused, was one not unknown to other religions also; on the ἀνειμένα or ἄνετα among the Greeks, see Hermann, *Gottesdienstl. Alterthümer der Griechen*, § 20, note 10.

(5) With this is connected the thought, again to use Keil's words, *id.*, "that the end of life for the Lord's flock does not consist in an incessant cultivation of the earth, combined with anxious labor in the sweat of their brow, but in the happy enjoyment of its fruits, which the Lord their God gives them without the work of their hands."

(6) The regulations in Deut. xxiii. 25 sq. concerning the eating of grapes and the plucking of ears of corn, so different from our ideas of the complete protection of property, arose from the same consideration.

(7) Thus this rest which God would every seventh year bestow upon His people, is, according to the intention of the commandment, no more a rest of idle inaction than is that of the Sabbath-day. For, we ask, is the life of the patriarchs, in which agriculture was only an incidental occupation (Gen. xxvi. 12), to be regarded as a life of idleness? That public reading of the law which took place at the beginning of the year involved, as has been already mentioned, a significant exhortation to a spiritual employment of this season. Ewald (*id.* p. 372)

thinks that this year may also have afforded opportunity for the more connected and continuous instruction of both children and adults.

(8) [On the question of the Mosaic origin of these institutions, comp. the observations of Dillmann on the Sabbath year, p. 604 sq.; on the year of jubilee, p. 606.]

(9) See Bertheau *in loc.*, and the Rabbinical passages in Majus, *id.* p. 122 sq.

(10) Sabbatical years are mentioned, 1 Macc. vi. 49, 53; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 8. 1, xiv. 10. 6, xv. 1. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 2. 4; and among the Samaritans in the days of Alexander the Great, *Ant.* xi. 8. 6.

(11) Comp. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. p. 464.

(12) See Maimonides, *id.* iv. 22. For the distinction made (Shebiith vi. 1) with respect to Palestine itself, between the region taken possession of by the children of Israel at their return from Babylon, and that conquered after the departure from Egypt, see p. 212 of the article quoted.

(13) *Shebiith*, vi. 2, 5, 6; Maimonides, *id.* iv. 23. On this subject comp. Geiger, *Lesestücke aus der Mischna*, pp. 75 sq. and 79.

III. THE THREE PILGRIMAGE FEASTS.

(*a*) THE PASSOVER (1).

§ 153.

Enactments concerning the Solemnity.

The enactments relating to the *Passover* are found in Ex. xii. 1–28, 43–49, xiii. 3–9, xxiii. 15; Lev. xxiii. 5 sq.; Num. xxviii. 16–25; Deut. xvi. 1 sq. Ex. xii. 1–20 contains the entire law of the Passover, as delivered to Moses and Aaron before the fact with which this feast was to be connected had taken place,—a circumstance the consideration of which will obviate many apparent difficulties. Next follows ver. 21 sqq., the promulgation of the law by Moses to the people; this as well as its fulfilment is given, in accordance with the circumstances of those times, in a fragmentary manner. The proceedings at the celebration of the Passover were as follow: Four days previously (xii. 3), the *paschal lamb*, a male of a year old, for which a kid might be substituted, xii. 5, was *to be set apart*, one lamb for each family if sufficiently numerous to consume it, or if not, one for two families (2). This setting apart was performed, as tradition asserts, in a solemn manner, the lamb being formally consecrated, and every member of the household commanded to esteem it holy. During the whole of the festival nothing leavened might be eaten (comp. Deut. xvi. 3); hence on the 14th Abib or Nisan (the spring month) *all leaven and leavened bread were cleared out of the house*. The feast itself was to commence on the 14th Abib by the slaughter of the paschal lamb (בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם); on the different meanings of this expression, see the remarks on the daily burnt-offering (§ 131). We must assume (with Hengstenberg) that in general the preparations for the repast took place on the 14th, and the repast itself, which formed the commencement of the feast of unleavened bread, on the 15th. At the *first* celebration in Egypt, the lamb was undoubtedly slain *by the head of the family*, who seems on this occasion to have taken in general the functions of the priest. The two side-posts and lintel of the door were to be sprinkled with the blood of the animal. This was subsequently omitted, when the Passover was, according to Deut. xvi. 5–7, solemnized in the sanctuary, and the slaughter

of the lamb took place in its court,—a fact alluded to in Ex. xxiii. 17. In the great Passover of Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxx. 16 sq., the *Levites* had the charge of killing the Passover chiefly for those who were not clean ; in that of Josiah, on the contrary, xxxv. 11, and also in that mentioned Ezra vi. 20, the Levites were exclusively intrusted with this office. The slaying was subsequently performed by the laity also (3). The blood of the lambs was caught by the priests, and poured out or sprinkled upon the altar, and the fat was burned upon it (4). The portions to be cast into the fire are called עֹלָה (burnt-offerings), 2 Chron. xxxv. 12. The whole animal was then eaten that same night, not a bone of it being broken, with *unleavened loaves* (מַצּוֹת) and *bitter herbs* (מְרֹרִים, wild lettuce, wild endive, etc.). None of it might be taken out of the house, nor was any of it to be left ; if however any portion remained, it was to be burned next morning. At the first Passover, they who ate it were to be *ready for a journey* (their staff in their hands, their shoes on their feet, and their loins girded) ; hence they were to eat standing, a particular subsequently omitted. It seems self-evident that *women* shared in the repast (5). *Strangers*, on the contrary, might not participate in it, until incorporated by circumcision among the covenant people, Ex. xii. 44, 48. It was this solemnity which was properly called פֶּסַח (6). According to xii. 13, it bore this name in remembrance of the fact that, in the night when the Lord slew the first-born of Egypt, He *passed over and spared* (פָּסַח)—strictly speaking (for this is the radical meaning of the word), leaped over—the Israelites (7). On this meaning see especially Isa. xxxi. 5, where the context shows (compare xxx. 29) that it is the Passover that is alluded to (8). In remembrance of what occurred at the institution of the Passover, the head of the household was, according to the subsequent ritual, with which we are not immediately concerned, to relate, in conformity with Ex. xii. 26 sq., the history of the deliverance of Israel during that night. The Hallel was then chanted by the assembled family, viz. Ps. cxiii. and cxiv., after the second cup and before eating the lamb, and Ps. cxv.-cxviii. before the fourth cup (9). *The seven days following the Feast of the Passover* are called in the Pentateuch חַג הַמַּצּוֹת, *the feast of unleavened bread*, because on them such bread alone might be eaten ; see especially Lev. xxiii. 6–8. In Deut. xvi. 2, the שְׁלָמִים offered during this festal season are also comprised under the term פֶּסַח,—the oxen mentioned 2 Chron. xxxv. 7–9 being used for such peace-offerings. Hence the expression paschal food may also be used of the sacrificial repasts which occurred during the week (10). It seems also probable that the eating of firstlings spoken of in Deut. xv. 19 sq. took place during the paschal week (comp. § 136. 1) (11). The burnt-offerings and sin-offerings prescribed for the festal season are found in Num. xxviii. 19–24. The first and seventh days of the feast week were *days of rest ;* for though in Deut. xvi. 8 (comp. Ex. xiii. 6) the sabbatical character of the seventh day only is asserted, this is explained by the consideration that it would have seemed superfluous expressly to ascribe this character to the first and chief day of the feast ; and hence we find that the Deuteronomic law treats this point in the same manner in the case also of Pentecost and the Feast of Tabernacles. According to the law, Lev. xxiii. 11, 15, the *sheaf of first-fruits of barley* was to be offered, *i.e.* waved before the Lord, מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, on "the morrow after the Sabbath," as a consecration of the harvest which

was now commencing. There was, however, among the ancient Jews, a dispute concerning the meaning of this phrase. The Pharisees [representing the prevalent tradition ; so the Septuagint, Philo, and Josephus] understood it of the day after the *first day of the feast*, thus making the waving of the sheaf take place on the 16th Nisan ; the Sadducees, of the day after the *weekly Sabbath* occurring in the time of the feast (12). Josh. v. 11, according to which the people ate, on the day after the Passover, parched corn of the produce of the land,—a fact which presupposes the offering of the sheaf of first-fruits,—decidedly favors the former view (13).

(1) The literature of the pilgrimage feasts is chiefly as follows : Hupfeld, *De primitiva*, etc., the two University (Halle) programmes for 1851 and 1852 ; Bachmann's *Die Festgesetze des Pentateuch*, 1858, chiefly directed against Hupfeld. Comp. also W. Schultz, "Die innere Bedeutung der alttest. Feste," *Deutsche Zeitschr.* 1857. On the Passover : Baur, "Ueber die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Passahfestes und des Beschneidungsritus," *Tübinger Zeitschr.* 1832, p. 40 sqq. ; and in opposition to Baur, Scholl, in Klaiber's *Studien der evang. Geistlichkeit Württembergs*, vol. v., and Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. p. 640 sq. ; Hengstenberg, "Das Passah," *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1852, No. 16 ; [Delitzsch's art. "Passah" in Riehm].

(2) According to Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9. 3, not less than from ten to twenty eaters were to be reckoned to one lamb. [According to later tradition, each one should receive a piece as large as an olive.—D.]

(3) The number of Levites would, however, have scarcely sufficed for the enormous quantity of paschal lambs. At Josiah's Passover, the king alone, according to 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, distributed thirty thousand lambs to the people ; while at the last Passover held at Jerusalem, the paschal offerings amounted, Josephus tells us, to 256,500.

(4) According to the undoubtedly correct statement of *Mishna Pesach*, v. 6, 10. The law enacted nothing in this respect.

(5) The Mishna also adopts this view. According to the Gemara, however, they were not obliged to be present as the males were.

(6) In the Septuagint *πάσχα*, a form derived from the Aramaic פַּסְחָא, in the *Status emphat.*

(7) Hence the word may also mean "to limp." On the other hand, it cannot, as Hengstenberg supposes, mean "to save, to deliver ;" nor can it, as some of the Fathers think, and as Hengstenberg supposes possible, be connected with *πάσχω*. Josephus, *Ant.* ii. 14. 6, explains the word by *ὑπερβασία*.

(8) The hypothesis of Baur, *id.*, that פֶּסַח originally signified the passing of the sun into the sign of the ram, is entirely opposed to the common use of פֶּסַח. This consideration suffices to overthrow the whole hypothesis which connects the Passover with the Theban spring festival, at which sacrifices were offered to Amun, the ram-god, *i.e.* to the sun entering the sign of the ram. Scholl and Bähr, *id.*, have shown how groundless this hypothesis is.

(9) Ps. cxiii.–cxviii. are generally called the great Hallel, though, strictly speaking, Ps. cxxxvi. might rather receive this appellation : "O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good ; and His mercy endureth for ever," etc. This Psalm was said at the close of the repast, after the Haggada-shel-pesahh, the assembled guests responding in the twenty-six times repeated כִּי לְעוֹלָם חַסְדּוֹ.

(10) This has been applied, as is well known, to the question raised in connection with the Gospel of John in respect to Christ's celebration of the Passover.

(11) See Riehm, *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 52.

(12) Hence the varying computations as to the time of this festival, comp. § 155.

(13) The theory started by Hitzig, revived by Hupfeld, and refuted by Bähr,

that the Passover always began on a Sunday and terminated on the 21st Nisan on a Saturday, and that this Sabbath is meant by מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, presupposes an arrangement of the year making it always begin on a Sunday, of which there is no kind of proof. The *after Passover*, Num. iv. 11, which was to be kept by such Israelites as had been prevented by ceremonial uncleanness from celebrating the Passover, and subsequently by those also who could not reach the sanctuary in time, has been already mentioned, § 145.

§ 154.

Significance of the Feast of the Passover, and Questions connected with it.

According to what has been stated, the *significance of the Feast of the Passover* was, *generally speaking*, an *historical* one; it was, that is to say, *celebrated in remembrance of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt*. By keeping this festival, the Israelite testified that he belonged to that people whom the Lord had, by this act of deliverance, made His own possession (1). In an *agrarian* point of view, this feast was also the consecration of the *beginning of harvest*. Its *special import* is more difficult to define. First, it may be asked whether the *Passover transaction proper is to be regarded in the light of a sacrifice*. This question was an apple of discord between the Romish and the Protestant theologians. The former, in the interest of their doctrine of sacrifice, affirmed that it was; the latter, for the same reason, felt bound to deny it, lest some doctrinal support should thus be furnished to the Romish mass. Certain Reformed theologians, however, *e.g.* Vitringa, entertained less prejudiced views. Among moderns, Hofmann has (in his *Schriftbeweis*) disputed the sacrificial character of the Passover; and his view has been refuted upon valid grounds by Kurtz (2). That no complete act of sacrifice took place at the first Passover is evident, the whole system of sacrifice being of later enactment; still the manipulation of the blood, by which the repast was preceded, had a thoroughly sacrificial import. The Passover is, moreover, exhibited in an expressly sacrificial point of view when it is said of it, Ex. xii. 27, וְזָבַחְתֶּם־פֶּסַח הוּא לַיהוָה, [it is Passover-sacrifice to Jehovah] comp. xxxiv. 25; and when Num. ix. 7, 13 designates its celebration as הִקְרִיב אֶת־קָרְבַּן יְהוָה. So too it is said, 1 Cor. v. 7: τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη: and Philo and Josephus both call it a sacrifice. The next question is, Under *what class of sacrifices is the Passover to be comprised?* Does it belong to the *sin-offerings*, or is it more akin to the *peace-offerings?* The former is maintained by Hengstenberg. "The Passover," he says, "is a sin-offering in the fullest and most special sense." But this view is absolutely irreconcilable with the most important feature of the Passover, viz. the *consumption* of the sacred animal by the family in whose name it was offered. It is beside the question to cite the eating of the flesh of the sin-offerings by the priests, for this was not done for the sake of their feeding on it (as has been shown, § 139); and the priest might not eat of the sin-offering offered for himself. The *repast* places the Passover in the class of the *peace-offerings*; and since there can be no peace-offering without an atonement, which is effected by the sprinkling of the blood, the Passover presupposes an act of expiation effected by the application of the blood of the paschal lamb. But to say that the paschal lamb suffered death vicariously—that at the institution of the solemnity it died

in the place of the first-born of Israel who had properly incurred death—is to assert that to which there is absolutely no allusion. The pure life of the victim offered up in the blood served for a *covering*, and therefore for a purification for the family approaching the sacred meal. The application of the blood to the door-posts of the house, which formed the place of sacrifice at the first Passover, had the same significance as the atonement and purification of the sanctuary with the blood of the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 16. Covered and purified by this blood, the house was secured against the destroying angel, who went through the land of Egypt, which had incurred the Divine judgment. Thus the blood of atonement certainly is, as Hengstenberg expresses it, the wall of partition between the people of God and the world (3).

The repast bore throughout the *character of a feast*. At the first Passover, the intention that the liberated people should commence their journey out of Egypt in the strength of this food, was included. Thus, too, the Israelite received at each Passover *new strength for the year just commenced*. An *individual* was not, however, to celebrate this feast, which was to be an *act of communion of the whole household*. Each family was at this repast to recognize that it was an integral element of the covenant people; and on the entire transaction was impressed the confession, "*As for me and my house*, we will serve the Lord" (Josh. xxiv. 15). The *prohibition against breaking a bone of the paschal lamb*, certainly meant more than an injunction not to treat it like an ordinary slaughtered animal; it required (comp. the use of the expression, Ps. xxxiv. 21) the preservation of the lamb in its entireness as a sign that those who were partakers of it were united in inseparable communion. Bähr rightly appeals in elucidation to the analogous passage, 1 Cor. x. 17. The prohibition also *of carrying any of it out of their houses* refers to that complete union of every family which the theocratic institutions enacted. *Unleavened bread* was, on account of its *purity*, to be eaten during the whole period of the feast; comp. above on leaven, § 124, and in elucidation, 1 Cor. v. 7 sq. As the newly consecrated priests were to eat unleavened bread seven days (see Ex. xxix. 30 sqq. in connection with ver. 2), so also was Israel to do when thus celebrating its election to be the priestly nation. Ex. xiii. 8 and Deut. xvi. 3, which connect an *historical* reminiscence, viz. that of the haste of the departure from Egypt, with the use of unleavened bread, are not in opposition to this idea, Deuteronomy in particular being distinguished by its multiplication of motives. Whether this bread is called לֶחֶם עֹנִי in the passage in Deuteronomy because its insipidity recalled the fare of their Egyptian bondage, or merely because it was eaten at their deliverance from this affliction, must be left undecided. *The bitter herbs* were certainly a sign of the bitterness of Egyptian slavery, with which the fact of their imparting a seasoning to the repast is not inconsistent (4).

(1) Hupfeld, *id.*, denies, without any valid reason, the historical import of the Passover, and says that an historical occasion for its institution was a subsequent invention. We might just as well maintain that the institution of the Lord's Supper was the invention of a later age. [According to Wellhausen (i. 85 sqq.) the feast, as *Mazzoth-feast*, was originally a harvest festival, and as such of Canaanitish origin (p. 95 sq.), since the keeping of a harvest festival presupposes a settled population devoted to agriculture. As a *Passover festival*, however, it was originally the festival of the offering of the firstlings of cattle. The history of

the slaying of the first-born of the Egyptians arose from this custom : it occasioned the tradition that God had violently taken from Pharaoh the first-born of man because Pharaoh had not consented that the Hebrews should celebrate in the wilderness the festival of the offering of the first-born. The historical motive for the Passover was not fully completed till the composition of Deuteronomy.—But aside from the consideration that it is a mere assumption that the living God could not have performed an act like the slaying of the first-born of Egypt for the redemption of his people, Wellhausen is obliged to abandon any explanation of the word Passover (p. 89) ; he is forced to explain the unleavened bread, by which he understands the bread baked in haste, thus : "First, mainly at the beginning of harvest, there was not time to leaven, knead, and bake the new meal, but a kind of cake baked in the ashes was quickly made of it" (p. 88). And the refutation furnished by the earliest passages, namely, the book of the Covenant (Ex. xxiii. 15), and the old law (Ex. xxxix. 18), of the position that the historical signification of the feast is of so late origin, he is obliged simply to set aside at a dash by the remark on the words, "for in it thou camest out of Egypt," "It seems as if the reference to the march out of Egypt, Ex. xxiii. 15, was introduced into it, at a later editing, from the entirely identical passage in Ex. xxxiv. 18" (p. 89).

(2) See Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. ed. 2, p. 270 sqq. ; Kurtz, History of the Old Covenant, ii. p. 297 sqq.

(3) Hupfeld also aptly compares what was done at the consecration and investiture of the priests, Ex. xxix. 20, when the blood of the ram was applied for atonement and purification to the ear, hand, and foot of the priest (§ 95). Comp. also the purification of the leper.

(4) The Passover, as a sacrifice, being connected with the sanctuary, the Israelites in exile celebrate it without the sacrificial lamb.

(*b*) THE FEAST OF WEEKS.

§ 155.

The *Feast of Weeks* (Pentecost), חַג הַשָּׁבֻעוֹת, owes its name to the fact that it was to be celebrated seven weeks after the Passover. The *more particular determination* of its time is, however, a subject of dispute, inasmuch as this depends on the already mentioned (§ 153) and variously understood passage, Lev. xxiii. 15 sq. It is there said : "Ye shall count unto you מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the wave sheaf," שֶׁבַע שַׁבָּתוֹת תְּמִימֹת תִּהְיֶינָה (seven full Sabbaths shall there be). If the Sabbath was, as we, § 153 (according to the usual interpretation), thought most probable, the first day of the paschal feast, שַׁבָּתוֹת here means *weeks*. The word has this meaning in Aramaic, and the predicate תְּמִימֹת favors it ; the passage in Deuteronomy substitutes שָׁבֻעוֹת שָׁבֻעוֹת. It must therefore be translated : "seven whole weeks shall there be" (and ver. 16 : "till the day following after the seventh week"). According to this computation, which thus makes the *terminus a quo*, the sheaf-day to be the 16th Nisan, the Feast of Pentecost would always fall on the same day of the week as the 16th Nisan. And such is the modern Jewish custom. If the other explanation of מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת (ver. 15), which makes the expression שַׁבָּת mean the Sabbath proper (Saturday), be adopted, the Feast of Weeks would, on the contrary, have always been kept on a Sunday (1). The second name of this feast was חַג הַקָּצִיר (the feast of harvest), or חַג הַבִּכּוּרִים (the feast of first-fruits). Accordingly it has in the Pentateuch the significance of a *harvest thanksgiving ;* and indeed of a feast of thanksgiving for the *completed* harvest,—the Feast of Weeks thus bearing the same re-

lation to the *wheat* harvest as the Passover did to the *barley* harvest, which was the first crop reaped. *An historical meaning* was first given to this feast by *the later Jews*, who made it refer to the *giving of the law upon Mount Sinai*, which is said by Jewish tradition to have taken place on the fiftieth day after the departure from Egypt, while Ex. xix. 1 states quite generally that it was in the third month. This reference, however, is not yet mentioned, even in Philo.

The central point in the religious celebration of this festival of one day's duration, was *the offering of the two loaves of first-fruits* for the whole people, and not, as some have understood the law, for each house. As the wave sheaf at the Passover was a sign that the harvest had begun, so were these wave loaves, לֶחֶם הַתְּנוּפָה, a sign that the harvest was completed. Being prepared and leavened from the flour of the newly reaped wheat, Lev. xxiii. 17, the ordinary food of the people was hallowed in them. As leavened, they could not be burned upon the altar, but were to be consumed by the priests. With the offering of these loaves were combined large burnt, sin, and peace offerings, ver. 18. The directions in Num. xxviii. 27 sqq. differ somewhat from this law. If two kinds of offering are to be understood in the two passages, the general festival sacrifices are intended in Num. xxviii., and only the pentecostal offerings which accompanied the two loaves in Lev. xxiii. 18. The feast was enlivened by festal repasts, Deut. xvi. 11, which were furnished by the free-will offerings, and served at the same time as benefactions; for Levites, strangers, widows, and orphans were to partake of them.

(1) [Dillmann also takes שַׁבָּתוֹת in the sense of weeks, but holds that not every week, but only that ending with the Sabbath could be so called, and finds therefore in this passage a proof for the position that by the Sabbath, according to which the bringing of the wave sheaf was regulated, the week is to be understood.]

(*c*) THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

§ 156.

The *Feast of Tabernacles*, חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת, was kept in the seventh month (Tisri), from the fifteenth day onward. Its duration was strictly only seven days. To these was added an eighth, also of a sabbatical character, the so-called עֲצֶרֶת, Lev. xxiii. 36 (of which hereafter). The *historic import* of this feast was to remind the people, by a seven days' dwelling in booths made of boughs, of the wandering of their fathers in the wilderness, during which they had to dwell in booths, Lev. xxiii. 42 sq. The admission of this festival into Zechariah's prophecy of Messianic times, Zech. xiv. 18, is undoubtedly founded on the kindred thought, that the keeping of the Feast of Tabernacles is an expression on the part of the nations, of their thankfulness for the termination of their wanderings, by their reception into the peaceful kingdom of the Messiah. According to its *agrarian import*, this feast was חַג הָאָסִיף, Ex. xxiii. 16, the feast of ingathering, *i.e.* of fruit and wine, in which respect it *terminated the agricultural year*. It was the *greatest feast of rejoicing of the year*, and provided with more numerous sacrifices than the others, Num. xxix. 12–34 (1). Very splendid ceremonies were subsequently added to it, especially the daily *libation of water*, probably with reference

to Isa. xii. 3, and the *illumination* of the court on the first day of the feast,—customs to which perhaps the words of Christ, John vii. 37, viii. 12, may refer (2). The eighth day of the feast bore, as we have said, the name of עֲצֶרֶת, Lev. xxiii. 36, Num. xxix. 35, which is also applied, Deut. xvi. 8, to the closing day of the paschal week. The explanation of this word, *a cohibitione operis*, from the intermission of labor, is improbable, as not showing why the name applies to these two days only. The expression probably means *conclusion*, viz. of the feast-time; and it is thus understood by the LXX, who render it by ἐξόδιον in the passages cited (3). The Atsereth of the Feast of Tabernacles, however, undoubtedly signified not merely the *clausula festi*, but also *the close of the whole annual cycle of feasts* (4). Hence the עֲצֶרֶת was rightly regarded by the Jews as a separate feast, to which a further festival was also subsequently added on the 23d Tisri, viz. the rejoicing of the law (שִׂמְחַת הַתּוֹרָה), to celebrate the termination of the annual reading of the law.

Thus the festal half of the Israelitish ecclesiastical year coincided with the season in which the annual bounties of nature were gathered; while during the wintry half of the year, on the contrary, the course of the Sabbaths and new moons was, according to the Mosaic ritual, uninterrupted by festivals (5).

(1) Josephus and Philo consider it in every respect the chief festival of the year.

(2) Isa. xii. 3: "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." Most probably John vii. 37, "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink," refers to the pouring out of water, of which it has been said that he who has not seen the rejoicing at the drawing of water at the Feast of Tabernacles does not know what rejoicing is. Perhaps viii. 12, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life," may refer to the illumination. It is quite intelligible that the Greeks (see Plutarch, *Sympos.* iv. 6. 2) should regard the Feast of Tabernacles, on account of its connection with the vintage, as a feast of Bacchus; it is only unintelligible that many moderns should have laid any weight on such a circumstance.

(3) On the other hand, the expression subsequently acquired the further meaning of a solemn assembly, Joel i. 14. Compare the use of the word עֲצָרָה, 2 Kings x. 20. [Dillmann on Lev. xxiii. 36 holds that the word signifies first an assembly, and then in a derived sense, a day of assembly, and that the signification *conclusion*, or day of conclusion, is not sustained by the ordinary meaning of the word.]

(4) So Philo, *de septen.* § 24, ed. Mang. ii. p. 298, understood the matter.

(5) It was not till afterward that the Feast of the Dedication in the ninth, and the Feast of Purim in the twelfth month, with which we are not at present concerned, were inserted. See § 191, and the article cited, p. 388 sq.

PART II.—PROPHETISM.

FIRST SECTION.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEOCRACY, FROM THE DEATH OF JOSHUA TO THE CLOSE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE TIMES OF THE JUDGES.

I.—THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE THEOCRACY TILL THE TIMES OF SAMUEL.

§ 157.

Course of Events. Import of the Office of Judge.

The history of the period of the judges, when viewed from the theocratic point of view in which it is presented in the Book of Judges, and especially in the second introduction to this book (ch. ii. 6–iii. 6) (1), exhibits a constant alternation between the apostasy of the people and their consequent chastisement by the Divine Power, on the one hand, and the return of the people to their God and the Divine deliverances therewith connected, on the other. The course of events during the three centuries preceding the time when Samuel filled the post of Judge, may be generally described as follows:—After Joshua, who had no immediate successor, and the other elders, who "had known all the works of the Lord that He had done for Israel" (Josh. xxiv. 31), had passed from the scene, the nation was left to itself, that its life might now be freely developed under theocratic institutions. So long as the remembrance of the Divine manifestations survived, the people remained faithful to these institutions. Even the internal war against the tribe of Benjamin, related in the sequel of the Book of Judges (ch. xix.–xxi.), which, occurring during the high-priesthood of Phinehas (according to xx., 27 sq.), must have been waged shortly after the death of Joshua, is an indication that the theocratic zeal of the nation had as yet suffered no diminution. This is, however, the last occasion for many years on which we meet with the united action of the whole people. For Joshua having committed the completion of the work of conquest to the individual tribes, it ceased to be

the common concern of the nation, and opportunity was thus given for the promotion of private interests. The several tribes were not always entirely successful in the petty warfare which they carried on; some of the still remaining Canaanites were not subdued; against others the sentence of extermination was not strictly carried out. Those who were rendered merely tributary, and suffered to dwell among the Israelites, not only seduced the people to the service of Canaanitish gods, but also gradually regained the mastery in isolated parts of the land. Irruptions of great nomadic hordes of Midianites and Amalekites from the east ensued, while the nation was repeatedly exposed to danger from the hostile attacks of the neighboring Moabites and Ammonites. In the West, the power of the Philistine Pentapolis, situate on the low-lying plains near the Mediterranean, became increasingly formidable after the middle period of the judges. The oppressions which the Israelites suffered at the hand of these different nations usually extended only to certain tribes; but this very circumstance was the reason why even these afflictions were not capable of drawing the tribes out of their isolation, and uniting them in a common enterprise. Such slothful selfishness on the part of individual tribes, in withdrawing from the national cause, is sharply reproved in the Song of Deborah, Judg. v. 15–17 (2).

In times of oppression like these (when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, ch. iii. 9, 15, iv. 3, etc.), individual men—the *Judges*—arose, who, aroused by the Spirit of Jehovah, turned back the hearts of the people to their God, revived in them the remembrance of God's dealings with them in past times, and then broke the hostile yoke under which they were suffering. The whole aim of the narrative in this book is not, however, fulfilled in the glorification of these men as the heroes of the nation—its design being rather to show that the help afforded was the result of an outpouring of the Divine Spirit; and that God, in effecting the deliverance of His people, made choice of the lowly and despised as His instruments. Compare what we find said of Shamgar, iii. 31. Very instructive in this respect is the history of Gideon, the most prominent among the earlier judges; see such passages as vi. 15, vii. 2 (3). It was on this account that these ministers of the theocracy were called, not kings or rulers, but Shophetim (judges). This name must not, however, be specially restricted to the exercise of the judicial office, though its performance is asserted in the cases of Deborah (iv. 5), Eli, and Samuel (4), and must be assumed in that of others, so far as they remained for any length of time at the head either of the whole nation or of single tribes. The word, however, has a wider meaning, and represents these men as advocates of those Divine claims which it was their part to maintain and restore. The office of judge was neither permanent nor hereditary, but purely personal. Called to a prominent position by the necessities of the times, they acted with energy in the affairs of the individual tribes at the head of which they were placed, but exercised no abiding influence upon the nation, which, on the contrary, relapsed into its former course, when its burdens were lightened or when the judge was dead; comp. especially the passage ii. 16–19 (5).

(1) There is, at the commencement of the Book of Judges, a double introduction. ch. i.–iii. 6, designed to serve as a key to the course upon which the history of Israel now enters. Comp. Cassel, *The Book of Judges*, Introduction: "The first two chapters form a practical introduction to the history of the book in general.

They explain the *possibility* of the ensuing events: the germs of the approaching apostasy could not have lain in the history of Joshua, for he followed, in the spirit of the law, the footsteps of Moses. The ground [of the apostasy] lay in the proceedings of the tribes after his decease."

(2) In the Song of Deborah, Judg. v., after praising those tribes which had taken part with her in the conflict, she continues 15–17: "At the brooks of Reuben there were great resolves of heart. Why didst thou remain among the sheepfolds? At the brooks of Reuben there were great resolves of heart. Gilead remained beyond Jordan; and why did Dan remain in ships? and why did Asher continue on the sea-shore, and remain in his creeks?"

(3) How deeply the deliverance wrought by Gideon was imprinted on the memory of the nation, is evident from Isa. ix. 3, x. 26, Ps. lxxxiii. 10, 12. For further particulars, see the article "Gideon" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* [and in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*].

(4) Of Samuel it is stated, 1 Sam. vii. 16, that he administered justice in various places of the land; and, viii. 2, that he made his sons judges in Beer-sheba (art. "Gericht und Gerichtsverwaltung").

(5) Most of the judges seem, after effecting the work of deliverance to which they were called, to have remained for the rest of their lives at the head of a portion of the nation (art. "Volk Gottes").

§ 158.

Religious Condition: Decline of the Theocratic Institutions.

The state of religion during the period of the judges, the decline of the theocratic institutions, and the intermingling of the worship of Jehovah with the Canaanitish deification of nature, are abundantly manifest from the description of the nation just given. But are we justified, it may be asked, in speaking of a *decline* of theocratic institutions, and does the Book of Judges really presuppose a legislation and a history such as the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua attest? (1). Does it not rather exhibit an embryonic and undeveloped condition in which those *elements* are still fermenting, from which a system of theocratic institutions was subsequently consolidated? (2). This latter view is opposed, generally speaking, not only to the already mentioned express declaration in ch. ii. (especially ver. 10 sq.), but also to the manner in which the present condition of the people is contrasted with their past glories (3) in the Song of Deborah (ch. v. 4), the genuineness of which not one has yet ventured to impugn. So far, however, as *religious* institutions in particular are concerned, it must be observed that it is foreign to the entire purpose of the Book of Judges to enter into the subject, and consequently the inference that institutions not mentioned therein could not have existed, is utterly unjustified. This applies equally to the Book of Joshua, which confessedly presupposes the Pentateuch. If, *e.g.*, it were to be inferred that, because an annual festival (whether that of Tabernacles or the Passover) at the national sanctuary is mentioned but once in the Book of Judges (ch. xxi. 19), no such cycle of festivals as is prescribed in the Pentateuch as yet existed, this would equally apply to the Book of Joshua, which mentions a festival, viz. the Passover, only in a single passage (ch. v. 10), and also to the subsequent historical books, with the exception of Chronicles. There are, however, quite sufficient data in the Book of Judges to show that, although during this period and down to Samuel the injunctions or ordinances of the law were for the most part neglected, and in

some particulars not yet introduced, the theocratic institutions, as they are said to have existed under Moses and Joshua, are nevertheless in all essential matters presupposed (4). The main question is: *Does the Book of Judges know of a central sanctuary as the only authorized place of sacrifice?* or did *several* sanctuaries of Jehovah exist contemporaneously in the times of the judges? at least, was such worship carried on at different holy places at the same time? (5). The actual state of affairs was as follows:—Even during their wanderings in the wilderness, and under the eye of the lawgiver, the people could not be brought, as is evident from Lev. xvii. 5, Deut. xii. 8, to renounce the custom of sacrificing in any place they might choose. How *much less*, then, would this be accomplished at a time when there was no individual of pre-eminent influence to enforce the claims of the law; and when the scattered people, dwelling among the Canaanites, and entering into religious intercourse with them, mingled their heathen customs with the worship of Jehovah, nay, even addicted themselves in a great degree to the adoration of the old gods of the land! Were we hence to infer that the law concerning unity of worship was not then in existence, we should be equally obliged to affirm this of the whole period down to the captivity (6), since, notwithstanding the severe measures of several kings, the high places for worship could never be wholly abolished. The establishment of the idolatrous sanctuary of Micah is explained, Judg. xvii. 6, by the fact that "every man did that which was right in his own eyes," while the condemnation of Gideon's schismatical worship (of which hereafter, § 159), viii. 27 can only be understood by assuming the *exclusive legality of the one national sanctuary*. With respect, however, to the sacrifices mentioned ch. vi. 18, xiii. 16, these were justified by the *theophany* which preceded them, and were in accordance with patriarchal usage (comp. § 114). In neither case is the institution of a *permanent* sacrificial service in question. This does not, however, apply to the time of Samuel, of which hereafter (§ 160). The national sanctuary, the *tabernacle*, was during the times of the judges permanently located at *Shiloh*, Josh. xviii. 1, xix. 51; Judg. xviii. 31; 1 Sam. i. sq.; comp. with Ps. lxxviii. 60; Jer. vii. 12. It was there that the *annual festivals* were solemnized, Judg. xxi. 19, 1 Sam. i. 3 sq.; and there that the regular sacrificial worship was offered, ii. 12 sq. A second legitimate tabernacle in some other locality is not once spoken of. The sanctuary under the oak at Shechem, mentioned Josh. xxiv. 26, probably refers to the altar built there by Abraham, Gen. xii. 6 sq. (7); a holy place there is also spoken of, Gen. xxxv. 4. Nothing is said, however, of sacrificial worship being there offered. In military engagements, the ark of the covenant used (even down to the building of the temple, 2 Sam. xi. 11, comp. xv. 24) to be brought to the central point of the battle, and sacrifices were there offered before it. So, in the contest against Benjamin, when it is said that all the people flocked to Bethel, Judg. xx. 26, it is evident from ver. 27 that the ark was there; there was, however, no permanent sanctuary, the altar being, as is shown by xxi. 4, erected only for a temporary purpose (8). The whole narrative, 1 Sam. iv., according to which the carrying away of the ark was regarded as a terrible calamity, is deprived of all meaning unless the existence of but a single ark is assumed (9).—The fact that the Books of Judges and Samuel take but little notice of the individual *sacrificial laws* in the Pentateuch, is easily accounted for by the *nature of their contents*. The only remarkable circumstance is, that though

we frequently meet with the burnt-offering and the peace-offering, a sin-offering is never mentioned, not even in 2 Sam. xxiv. 25,—a phenomenon which indeed occurs also in the Book of Joshua. It seems that a special use of עֹלָה prevails here; and that this expression, as is evidently the case in Ezra viii. 35, comprises, in contradistinction to זֶבַח, the sin-offering also (see Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 71 sq. The peace-offering of the Pentateuch is presupposed in 1 Sam. ii. 13–17 (10). It has also been claimed *that the Book of Judges knows nothing of the calling of the tribe of Levi, as appointed in the Pentateuch.* [Comp. § 92, note 2; 93, note 6.] On the contrary, we regard it as a prominent and remarkable fact, that the Levites appear in the Book of Judges in exactly that position which Deuteronomy assumes, when it always classes them with the strangers on account of their poverty. The case seems to have been as follows: All the Canaanites not being driven out when the land was conquered, the cities appointed for the Levites did not come into the undisturbed possession of the Israelites, *e.g.* Gezer, Josh. xxi. 21, comp. with xvi. 10; Ajalon, Josh. xxi. 24, comp. with Judg. i. 35. Hence it would be quite natural for many of the Levites to seek an asylum in cities not included in the list of those allotted to them. Thus, in Judg. xvii. 7 sq., a Levite is spoken of as sojourning as a "stranger" (גָּר) in Bethlehem, and departing thence to Mount Ephraim; and in xix. 1, a Levite is also said to be dwelling as a "stranger" on the northern side of Mount Ephraim (11). It is not difficult to show why there were as yet no organized Levitical services. The services appointed to the Levites in the Pentateuch ceased with the wanderings of the tabernacle, and nothing was enacted in the law with respect to their further employment; while the period of the disintegration of the theocracy was one utterly unadapted for the production of new ordinances of worship. Still the expression used xix. 18 by the Levite, אֶת־בֵּית יְהוָה אֲנִי הֹלֵךְ, which is to be understood, "I walk in the house of the Lord," refers to a connection of this Levite with the sanctuary (12). The narrative ch. xvii. sq. also shows that the fact that this tribe was appointed to the service of the sanctuary was well known. According to xvii. 13, Micah congratulates himself on obtaining a Levite as priest to his image-worship. This priest, who was subsequently engaged for the sanctuary set up in Dan, was, according to xviii. 30, Jonathan, a descendant of Moses (13). The position occupied by the Levites after the times of David would be quite inexplicable, if the law had not previously separated this tribe to the service of the sanctuary.

With respect to the *history of the priesthood*, there is in this case also a great gap in the historical books of the Old Testament. *Aaron*, the choice of whom is also mentioned 1 Sam. ii. 27 sq., was, after his death, succeeded by his two surviving sons *Eleazar* and *Ithamar*, the former filling the high-priestly office, Num. xx. 28, Deut. x. 6, Josh. xiv. 1, and being succeeded therein by his son *Phinehas;* comp. Judg. xx. 28. The history of the high-priesthood is not again taken up till *Eli*, 1 Sam. i. sq., who was, according to tradition (Josephus, *Antiq.* v. 11. 5), with which the further course of Old Testament history coincides, of the line of Ithamar. The reason for the transmission of the high-priestly dignity to this line is unknown. On the high priests between Ithamar and Eli, see Josephus; and on the genealogy of Eleazar, 1 Chron. v. 29 sq., vi. 35 sq.; Ezra vii. 1 sq. (14).

(1) Great stress has always been laid upon this point by the opponents of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. [So De Wette and Vatke, and most recently *e.g.* Wellhausen, who maintains that "the course of Israelitish history proceeds steadily upward toward the establishment of the kingly authority, instead of downward from the splendid age of Moses and Joshua" (i. p. 245). Similarly Reuss, § 94 sqq., regards the time of the Judges as the age of "club-law, delighting in fighting and plundering, such as usually precedes the formation of proper states." Still he recognizes Moses as an historical person of high importance, and admits that "his spirit was stamped upon the national development and gave it direction." He attributes to him the "original thought, which, closely uniting faith and nationality for mutual security and defence, grounds genuine freedom upon right obedience, by the institution of an absolute theocracy." The principle and ordinance of divine worship also, as it afterward existed in Israel, he ascribes, at least in its fundamental features, to Moses. The view presented in this section is more nearly approached by F. W. Schultz (in Zöckler's *Handbuch*, i. p. 270 sq.), and more decidedly by Riehm (art. "Richter," in his *Handwörterbuch*) ; on this point, however, consult especially Köhler, vol. ii.]

(2) This has been especially maintained by De Wette and Vatke. To draw such inferences from a book which, like that of Judges, includes a period of 300 years in twenty-one chapters, is *à priori* a very doubtful proceeding. In the Old Testament theology the points chiefly discussed must be those relating to worship.

(3) Judg. v. 4 sq. : "Lord, when Thou wentest out of Seir, when Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled, and the heavens dropped, the clouds also dropped water. The mountains melted from before the Lord, that Sinai before the Lord God of Israel." Then follows a description of recent times : "In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath, in the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, and the walkers in paths walked through byways. There lacked leading in Israel, there lacked, till I Deborah arose, till I arose a mother in Israel. They chose new gods ; then was war in the gates. Was there a shield or spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?"

(4) On what follows, comp. especially Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 1 sqq.; Köhler ii. p. 5 sqq.

(5) Vatke, *Religion des A. T.* p. 264, brings forward seven such holy places. [Comp. in Wellhausen the section upon the place of worship, i. 17 sqq.; Oehler, § 114, note 3–5 ; Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, pp. 159–168.]

(6) [The Graf school actually maintain that the unity of worship was not prescribed as a law till the time of Josiah at the earliest.]

(7) Unless, which would be the single exception, the tabernacle, which indeed was to continue a wandering sanctuary (comp. 2 Sam. vii. 6), was transported for a time from Shiloh to the neighboring Shechem.

(8) That sacrifices should be offered wherever the ark was, is quite natural when its significance is considered. On similar grounds, the act of sacrifice related 1 Sam. vi. 15 is not surprising. When it is there said that "the men of Beth-shemesh brought burnt-offerings," the expression does not exclude the co-operation of the priests. Beth-shemesh was, moveover, one of the cities of the priests.

(9) Those who, for the sake of the theory that there were several sanctuaries, embrace also the notion of several arks, have the usage of the language, which constantly speaks of *the* (definite) ark, against them.

(10) Of this there is no doubt. The fat is designated as the part belonging to Jehovah ; and it is brought forward as the special transgressions of the sons of Eli, that they demanded their portion before the fat was burned to the Lord, etc. (see Hengstenberg's *Genuineness*, etc.; Köhler, ii. p. 14, note 2.)

(11) Others, as is assumed Deut. xviii. 6–8, might, after selling their property, settle at the place of the sanctuary, and they were then entitled to like maintenance with the ministering Levites. How such maintenance was to be supplied, we are not told,—probably from the free-will offerings. (Article *Levi, Levites.*)

(12) Judg. xix. 18 cannot mean, "I am going *to* the house of the Lord," for אֵת never occurs with the accusative of direction.

(13) The reading מְנַשֶּׁה with *Nun suspensum* is confessedly a later alteration for מֹשֶׁה. In the case, too, of Samuel, his employment in the service of the sanctuary (1 Sam. ii. 18) coincides with his Levitical descent.

(14) In these genealogies it is not said which of the descendants of Eleazar therein enumerated filled the office of high priest, and which did not. Compare my article "Hohepriester" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*

§ 159.

Continuation: Religious Syncretism of this Period.

The *commixture with other religions*, the foundations of which were (as before remarked, § 26) already laid during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, was manifested in *a twofold manner* during the age of the judges. *First*, by a blending of the worship of Jehovah with heathenism, on the part of those Israelites who had fallen into Canaanitish idolatry. Thus in the worship of *Baal* or *El-berith*, to whom a temple was dedicated at Shechem, Judg. viii. 33, ix. 4, 46, the idea of the covenant God was transferred to Baal. *Secondly*, by the fact that, even among those who adhered to the worship of Jehovah, the religious consciousness was more or less obscured by heathen ideas. Hence the image-worship of *Micah* and the *Danites*. To this a widely accepted theory would add the conduct of *Gideon*, who, after having destroyed the worship of Baal at Ophrah, vi. 12 sq. (1), and delivered Israel from the oppression of the Midianites, and refused in a truly theocratic spirit the hereditary sovereignty offered him (viii. 23), is said himself to have set up (viii. 24) an idolatrous image-worship. But by the ephod which he caused to be made, we are not to understand an image of Jehovah, the word not being generally used in the sense of image. It is evident from xvii. 5, xviii. 14, 17, that the ephod is *distinguished* from teraphim, graven image, and molten image, and signifies simply the garment of the high priest (2). It is true that the large quantity of gold collected by Gideon was not required for the garment with the breast-plate (comp. also Ex. xxviii. 6 sq., xxxix. 2 sq.), but neither are we told that it was all used (comp. the construction of עָשָׂה, Hos. ii. 10) (3). In fact, it is not said that Gideon set up an idol at all, but that, by renouncing the legally ordained priesthood, he instituted a schismatical worship. His preparation of an ephod was designed to furnish a means of interrogating the Divine will by Urim and Thummim; and his motive for separating from the legitimate sanctuary may perhaps be found in the fact of its being situated in the midst of the tribe of Ephraim, which was hostile to him. The censure expressed by the narrator is shown to be fully justified by the results which ensued after Gideon's death, see viii. 33, when this schismatical worship facilitated the relapse of the people to the worship of Baal, who was syncretistically worshipped as Baal-berith (4).

Finally, the narrative concerning Jephthah, xi. 28–40, belongs here. When he went out against the Ammonites, he vowed, if he should return victorious, to offer as a burnt-offering to Jehovah whatever should come forth to meet him from the doors of his house, and when this proved to be his own daughter, who

was also his only child, he did not dare to break his vow, but performed it in respect to her. The opinion which prevailed in Jewish antiquity (see Josephus and the Targums) and among the Fathers of the Church, and which was also embraced by Luther, is that Jephthah really slew his daughter, and offered her as a burnt-offering upon the altar. The view that Jephthah only consecrated his daughter to the service of the sanctuary in a state of life-long virginity, was first urged by certain mediæval Rabbins, and has since been maintained by Hengstenberg, who led the way (*Genuineness*, ii. p. 105 sqq.), and by several recent commentators (Cassel, Gerlach, Keil), who refer to Ex. xxxviii. 8 and 1 Sam. ii. 22, where women are mentioned as serving in the sanctuary. Their obligation to celibacy however cannot be proved. According to this view, the fulfilment of the vow would lie in the words in Judg. xi. 39, which must not be taken as pluperfect ("and she had known no man"), but as an account of what now took place: "and she knew no man." It may be granted that there are some things in the narrative favorable to this view, especially the consideration that, when Jephthah placed at God's disposal whatever should first come forth from his house to meet him, he must have contemplated the possibility of its being a human being, in which case it was impossible that he would have intended a human sacrifice; and the more so, since no such sacrifice is mentioned in the time of the Judges, even among those Israelites who apostatized to Canaanitish idolatry. It may be further conceded that the grief of the father is also accounted for by the view in question, all prospect of posterity being cut off by the devotion of this his only child to celibacy. Still this interpretation is at variance with the plain meaning of the words, "he did unto her according to his oath," which in their reference to ver. 31 cannot relate to a merely spiritual sacrifice. It cannot, however, be inferred from the narrative that human sacrifices were at this time *legal* in the worship of Jehovah, the matter being evidently represented as a horrible exception. The history, indeed, shows that in those days, when the worship of Baal and Moloch was still contending for the mastery with that service of Jehovah, which was not as yet firmly established in the minds of men, the fear of the Holy One of Israel, the avenger of broken vows, might, even in the heart of a servant of the Lord, be perverted to the shedding of human blood for the sake of keeping a rashly uttered vow (5). The narrative of the Benjamite war and the slaughter of the inhabitants of Jabesh (xxi. 5–10) also show to what an extent theocratic zeal held the sanguinary fulfilment of an oath allowable.

(1) Hence the name of honor, Jerubbaal, LXX Ἱεροβάαλ, by which he is also mentioned 1 Sam. xii. 11, and which is exchanged, 2 Sam. xi. 21, for Jerubbesheth, בֹּשֶׁת = בֹּשֶׁת (shame), a contemptuous name of the idol, was bestowed upon Gideon. The word, according to Judg. vi. 32, can in the first instance be no otherwise interpreted than as, "Let Baal contend," *i.e.* against him. For further discussion on this name, see the article "Gideon" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* v. p. 151; comp. also Hengstenberg, *Genuineness*, i. p. 237 sq.; Movers, *Phönicier*, i. p. 128 sqq.

(2) See Hengstenberg, *Genuineness*, ii. p. 80, and Bertheau's *Commentary on the Book of Judges*, p. 133. The latter is arbitrary, however, in making Gideon set up the image of a calf, as was subsequently done by Jeroboam. For why may not Gideon have worshipped Jehovah, by means of the altar mentioned Judg. vi. 24, which symbolized the presence of Jehovah, and was still standing in the days of the narrator, without an image?

(3) We are not told whether the sacred garment was worn by Gideon as a priest, or set up as an object of worship. The former seems probable.

(4) Gideon's sin was visited upon his house, when his sons were afterward slain by their half-brother Abimelech at the place of his illegal worship. The tragical fate of Gideon's family is related Judg. ix.

(5) The case of the Gibeonites (Josh. ix.), when the people did not venture to break an oath, even though it was contrary to a Divine command, may be mentioned in illustration.

II.—RESTORATION OF THE THEOCRATIC UNITY BY SAMUEL. GROWTH OF PROPHETISM. FOUNDATION OF THE MONARCHY.

§ 160.

The Philistine Oppression. Changes effected by Samuel.

The appearance of *Samuel*, and the growth of Prophetism by his means, form the *turning-point of the period of the Judges*. The new state of affairs had been *prepared for*, partly by the *Philistine oppression*, which was both a longer and a heavier judgment than any with which the people had yet been visited, and partly by the judgeship of Eli. For since the judgeship depended in his case not upon a successfully conducted war or on any other act of heroism, but upon the high-priestly office, the sanctuary could not fail to acquire fresh importance, and consequently the theocratic union fresh power with the people. Their first attempt, however, to break the Philistine yoke by a united effort, ended in a fearful overthrow, in which even the *ark of the covenant*, which had so often led them to victory, fell into the hands of the enemy, 1 Sam. iv. The oppression of the Philistines then became still more grievous, for it is evident, from xiii. 19–22, that they disarmed the entire nation. The fact that the ark of the covenant, the medium of Jehovah's help and presence, had fallen into the hands of the heathen, could not fail to exercise an important influence upon the religious life of the people. The ark, after being restored by the Philistines, was for a long time laid aside: "It was not inquired after," 1 Chron. xiii. 3 (comp. Ps. cxxxii. 6); it continued an object of fear, but not of worship (1). The *tabernacle* was transferred from Shiloh, as a place now rejected of God, to *Nob* in the tribe of Benjamin; but, having lost with the ark its essential significance as the place of God's habitation, it ceased to be the religious centre of the nation, though, as we may infer from 1 Sam. xxi. and xxii. 17 sqq., the Levitical services were carried on in it without interruption. The person of *Samuel*, moved as he was by the prophetic spirit, was now the centre of the nation's life. The sanctuary being rejected, and the agency of the high-priesthood suspended, the mediatorship between God and His people rested with the prophet, who, though not of the priestly race, but by descent a Levite of the region of Ephraim (2), now performed sacrificial services in the presence of the people (1 Sam. vii. 9 sqq.). The *central sanctuary no longer existing*, we now also find *various* places of sacrifice, as the high places at Ramah, 1 Sam. ix. 13, Bethel and Gilgal, x. 3 sq., comp. xi. 15, xv. 21. Thus were the bounds imposed by the Mosaic ritual for the first time broken through. Israel attained to the experience

that the presence of God is not confined to an appointed and material symbol, but that wherever He is sincerely invoked, He bestows His abundant blessing. The day of penitence and prayer for which Samuel assembled the people at Mizpah, in the tribe of Benjamin, after he had put down idolatry, became, by the help of Jehovah, who acknowledged the prayer of His prophet, a day of victory over their enemies, and the beginning of their deliverance (ch. vii.). Samuel was henceforth judge of the whole nation; and the prophetic office began from this time to develop its agency, on which account the history of Prophetism, properly speaking, dates from Samuel (Acts iii. 24).

(1) 1 Sam. xiv. 18, where, moreover, the LXX assume a different reading, treats of an exception, which is alluded to as such.

(2) Samuel was, according to 1 Chron. vi. 13, 18, of the house of Kohath. His father is called אֶפְרָתִי, in the same sense as the Levite in Judg. xvii. 7 is said to be of the family of Judah. The frequent occurrence of the name of Samuel's father Elkanah among the Levitical proper names, especially among the Korahites, Ex. vi. 24, 1 Chron. vi. 7 sq., xii. 6, 9, xv. 23, is remarkable (see Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 50 f. This name, like its kindred one Mikneiah, 1 Chron. xv. 18, 21, points to the office of the Levites. The fact that Samuel was devoted to the service of the sanctuary by a special vow, proves nothing against his Levitical descent [although this is maintained by Reuss (§ 116)], because without this vow such service was not binding on him till he should be twenty-five years of age; and even Levites were not obliged to remain constantly at the sanctuary (art. "Levi, Leviten"). [Comp. Riehm's art. "Elkana," in his *Handwörterbuch*, and Kohler, ii. p. 95.]

§ 161.

Nature, Importance, and first Beginnings of the Prophetic Office (1).

The position occupied by the *prophetic office* in the organism of the theocracy has already been generally referred to, § 97: we must now treat more particularly of its institution and duties, in which respect also our point of departure must be the fundamental passage Deut. xviii. 9–21. The character of the prophetic, differed entirely from that of the priestly office. It was not, like the latter, confined to one tribe and one family, nor, generally speaking, to an external institution, though a certain external succession subsequently took place. It is said, ver. 15, "the Lord will *raise up* (יָקִים) a prophet,"—an expression used also of the judges, Judg. ii. 16, 18, iii. 9, 15, etc., and denoting the freeness of the Divine vocation; and again, "*from the midst of thee*, of thy brethren" (comp. Deut. xviii. 18), showing that the call to the office of prophet was to know no other restriction than that of being confined to the covenant people. This office, however, was not to be severed from the historical connection of revelation, but to begin from Moses and to continue his testimony (vers. 15, 18). The prophet was to prove his Divine mission, not so much by signs and wonders—for the performance of which even a false prophet might receive power—as by his confession of the God who redeemed Israel and gave them the law (xiii. 2–6). Again, what the prophet spoke was to *come to pass* (יָבֹא); that is, the prophetic word was to be corroborated by its historical fulfilment. In the first respect, the prophetic office, while itself exercised within the unalterable ordinances of the law, was *designed to prevent a mere lifeless transmission of legal injunctions*, by proclaiming to the people the de-

mands of the Divine will in a manner constantly adapted to the needs of the age, and in all the life and vigor of a message ever newly coming forth from God. In the second respect, it was to *cast a light on the future of the people*, and to disclose to them the Divine counsels, whether for their warning or comfort (comp. Amos iii. 7), and thus to initiate them in the ways of the Divine government. In this particular also it might be regarded as continuing the testimony of the law, which not only revealed God's requirements to His people, but also manifested the law of His procedure toward them, and the end of His government, Lev. xxvi., Deut. xxviii.–xxx., xxxii. (2). God's witness to Himself among heathen nations is more a matter of the past, a subject of remembrance ; in prophecy, on the contrary, a lasting and lively intercourse is established between God and the covenant people, on which account the silence of prophecy is a sign that the Lord has withdrawn from His people, and therefore a sign of judgment (comp. Amos viii. 12, Lam. ii. 9, Ps. lxxiv. 9). But the progress accomplished by revelation in prophecy will not be fully discerned, till the prophetic life and that *endowment with the Spirit* which constituted a prophet are taken account of, as well as the prophetic *word* itself. The prophet is the man of the Spirit. By the רוּחַ יְהוָה is the Divine word put into the mouth of the prophet, hence also his name נָבִיא. The root נָבָא is akin to נָבַע, which (comp. also נוּב, נָבַךְ) signifies to spring forth, to gush forth, the Hiphil הִבִּיעַ being used of speech flowing forth from a full heart. נָבִיא then means, not, as it is now usually explained, that which is spoken (or more precisely, gushed forth) by the Divine Spirit, but (see Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrbuch*, § 149 *e*, 2) *the speaker*—yet not in an active sense, but, as is shown by the passive form, him who is the *speaker as the instrument of another*, viz. God. The נָבִיא is the *interpreter* (comp. Ex. vii. 1 : "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy נָבִיא," which is expressed iv. 16 : "he shall be to thee for a mouth") ; hence the speech of the prophet, as being determined by the spiritual power which fills and incites him, is designated by the passive or reflective forms Niphal and Hithpael נִבָּא, הִתְנַבֵּא (comp. Ewald, *id.* § 124 *a*) (3). Among those spiritual gifts by which Jehovah fits men for the different callings which the service of His kingdom requires (comp. § 65), the gift of prophecy is that which institutes a direct personal intercourse between God and man ; and prophecy thus becomes, through God's self-witness to the prophet, the type of the teaching of His people by God Himself under the new covenant, Jer. xxxi. 34, John vi. 45. The operation of the Divine Spirit, however, upon the prophet, was not merely intellectual, but one which renewed the whole man. The prophet became another man, 1 Sam. x. 6, and received another heart, ver. 9. Thus prophecy was also an anticipation of the καινὴ κτίσις of the new covenant,—a circumstance which explains the saying of Moses, Num. xi. 29 : "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!" (4).

The first beginnings of prophecy (5) reach back to the times before Samuel (comp. Jer. vii. 25). For *Moses*, though standing far above all prophets (Num. xii. 6–8, comp. § 66) as mediator of the fundamental revelation and administrator of the entire Divine economy, as well as by reason of that nearer vision of God vouchsafed to him as a special privilege, was himself a prophet (comp. Deut. xxxiv. 10, Hos. xii. 14), and that not merely in the broader sense in which the word נָבִיא

was already applied to the patriarchs (Gen. xx. 7, Ps. cv. 15), because the word of God came to and proceeded from them, but in its proper signification, as partaking of that endowment of the Spirit which constitutes a prophet (Num. xi. 25) (6). Besides Moses, his sister Miriam is also called, Ex. xv. 20, נְבִיאָה, which must not be explained as singer (or poet), for she expressly claims (Num. xii. 2) the honor that the Lord had spoken by her (7). In the earlier times of the judges, the gift of prophecy appeared but occasionally; in the person of Deborah, who is called (Judg. iv. 4) the prophetess, because (vers. 6 and 14) the word of the Lord came by her, it was united to the office of judge. By the מַלְאַךְ־יְהוָה, ii. 1, we must probably understand not a human messenger, but the angel of the Lord. On the other hand, it is a prophet who appears, xi. 7, during the Midianite oppression, to remind the Israelites of their deliverance from Egypt, and to reprove them for their idolatry. In like manner does a "man of God" (1 Sam. ii. 27) exercise the office of a rebuker of the high priest Eli and his family, entirely in the manner of the later prophets. There must also, as may be inferred from ix. 9, have been from time to time seers (רֹאֶה, as they were usually called, instead of נָבִיא), with whom counsel was taken in private affairs, but of whom a more extensive sphere of operation cannot be assumed. It cannot be proved from Amos ii. 11 that the *schools of the prophets* existed before Samuel, as has been conjectured, *e.g.* by Vatke (*Religion des alten Testaments*, p. 285 sqq.); nor from the fact that Samuel was a Nazarite as well as a prophet (8), that prophecy being thus combined with Nazaritism, these schools of the prophets existed in the form of ascetic associations, into which many retired during those troublous times. This absence of proof is increased by the manner in which the period preceding Samuel is characterized, 1 Sam. iii. 1, as one without prophets, by the words: "The word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open vision" [*i.e.* no revelation spread abroad, or common.—D.].

(1) See my article "Prophetenthum des A.T." in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xii. p. 211 sqq. [Kleinert, art. "Prophet," in Riehm; König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des A. T.* 1882]. A notice of the literature on the prophetic office in general, is given in Keil's *Introduction to the Old Test.* § 61.

(2) In both respects, prophecy is one of the highest proofs of favor which God shows to His people, and is placed on a level (Amos ii. 11, Hos. xii. 10 sq.) with their deliverance from Egypt and their subsequent leading through the wilderness.

(3) [The etymology of the word is held to be different by König, who devotes to it (p. 71 sqq.) a thorough discussion. He maintains that the root to be appealed to is not נָבַע but the Arabic *nabaa*, signifying "to bring forth words, to speak." The form נָבִיא he regards not as passive, but as intransitive, the *i* having been lengthened from *e*, as *e.g.* in נֵעִים; to the Niphal and Hithpael נִבָּא and הִתְנַבָּא he gives the meaning "to show oneself a prophet." The view given in the text that the word is passive and represents the speaker as the organ of another, König justly pronounces untenable, and comes to the result that the word, derived as it is from the Arabic root mentioned, can only be active, and means therefore a speaker, especially a speaker in a superior sense, the speaker of God, the medium of divine revelation. As Orelli (*Die Altest. Weissagung*, 1882) puts it, in his excellent note (p. 7): "Of the active signification of this word, held by Delitzsch, Hofmann, Ewald, Dillmann, and Schulz, there can be no doubt, and the only question is whether the word expresses an involuntary and violent utterance, or whether it simply means *announcer*, *speaker*, and in

usage is further employed to convey the idea of the speaker of God and divine mysteries. The Arabic *nabaa* favors the latter, as does also the name of the Assyrian god Nebo (the speaker or revealer) from the same root." Whatever may have been its etymological meaning, its meaning in Hebrew usage is determined by Ex. vii. 1. Comp. Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, p. 389 sq., and R. Payne Smith, *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*, pp. 48–56.—D.]

(4) It is for this very reason that that outpouring of the Spirit which calls into existence the future church of the redeemed, in which all are directly taught of God and bear His law within them as a sanctifying vital power (Jer. xxxi. 34), is represented as a universal bestowal of the gift of prophecy (Joel iii. 1). These general propositions will be further carried out in the subsequent didactic section (§ 205 sqq.).

(5) [Comp. on this point and against the attempt of Kuenen to give to prophecy a Canaanitish origin, König, p. 57 sqq. ; also Reuss, § 70.]

(6) If the history of the Old Testament revelation advances from theophany to to inspiration (comp. § 55), the latter as well as the former is already found in Moses.

(7) Joshua, whom the son of Sirach, xlvi. 1, designates as *διάδοχος Μωυσῆ ἐν προφητείαις*, is never called נָבִיא.

(8) This much only can be said, that Nazaritism may have become more widely diffused in the period of the judges by the examples of Samuel and Samson. The commotions of the times may have the more powerfully led individuals, by taking upon them this vow, to present to the people the image of its sacred and priestly destination. The expression, Amos ii. 11, "I raised up," etc., as well as what is said ver. 12, points to the contrast in which such God-devoted persons stood to the mass of the people.

§ 162.

The so-called Schools of the Prophets. The Prophetic Office of Watchman.

In the times of *Samuel*, on the contrary, a greater number of prophets appear, in consequence of the powerful spiritual movement by which the nation was affected. These gathered around Samuel, and formed the so-called *schools of the prophets*. These institutions, concerning which every possible theory has been held, have been regarded by some as monastic brotherhoods, by others as secret societies, by others—and this view, expressed in their ordinary designation as schools of the prophets, is the most widely spread—as educational establishments (1). They make their appearance at only two periods of Israelitish history, viz. in the days of Samuel, and in the kingdom of the ten tribes in the times of Elijah and Elisha. The purpose of these schools of the prophets, and apparently their arrangements being very different under Samuel and in the days of Elijah, the two accounts must be considered separately.

We first meet (1 Sam. x. 5–12) with a number (חֶבֶל, properly a band) of prophets coming with instruments of music from the high place (בָּמָה) of Gibeah in the tribe of Benjamin, and prophesying. It is not said that these prophets had also a dwelling at this high place ; they seem rather to have been journeying to the place of worship found there (Thenius, *in loc.*, thinks otherwise). We next find, xix. 19 sqq., an assembly (לְהָקָה) of prophets prophesying, with Samuel at their head, at Ramah in נָיוֹת (Keri נָיוֹת), *i.e.* dwellings, which expression denotes a place of residence consisting of several habitations, and consequently a college of prophets. There is no reason for supposing a *school* properly so called. The

prophetic gift was not to be engendered by instruction (it was not the product of study and reflection, but the immediate effect of the Divine Spirit). It must also be noticed that *prophets* (נְבִיאִים) assembled around Samuel are here spoken of, not, as subsequently, *sons* of the prophets, בְּנֵי נְבִיאִים,—an expression denoting disciples of the prophets (comp. § 174). By this assembly of prophets, then, we understand rather an *association of prophets* drawn together by the leading of the Spirit, and among whom the prophetic gift was cherished by sacred exercises performed in common. This view of the matter leads us to infer that Samuel aimed, in those days when the sanctuary, deprived of the ark, was no longer the central point of the theocracy, to found a home for the newly kindled religious life of the nation. The extraordinary manifestations in which the prophetic inspiration displayed itself, and the overwhelming and irresistible influence it exercised on all who came within its circle, are common to this first appearance of prophecy, and to the early vigor of kindred spiritual movements (2). There is not a hint that the association of prophets at Ramah consisted chiefly, as some have supposed, of Levites, no privileges of birth being in this respect of any avail,—a circumstance alluded to x. 12 (3). Nor can it be legitimately inferred that the cultivation of vocal and instrumental music was a direct end of this union, musicians being in fact distinguished, ver. 10, from prophets. Music was designed, on the one hand, to prepare the mind for the apprehension of the Divine voice (comp. 2 Kings iii. 15) ; on the other, to be a vehicle for the utterance of the prophetic inspiration (4). That *sacred literature* was also cherished in this association at Ramah, may be regarded as certain, for prophetic authorship undoubtedly begins with Samuel,—at first, indeed, in the form of theocratic history (5). (For lack of further information, nothing more can be said concerning the internal arrangements of the schools of the prophets, or, to speak more correctly, of the association of the prophets in Samuel's time, for the existence of any other college than that at Ramah cannot be proved.) The public and powerful agency exercised from this time forward by those who filled the prophetic office, shows that a contemplative life passed in seclusion from the world was out of the question for those who were members of the association of prophets. This agency, after Samuel had founded the kingdom, and delivered up to the king the authority he had exercised as judge, may be defined as that of *watchmen to the theocracy*, whence the prophets are frequently designated צֹפִים or מְצַפִּים (comp. Mic. vii. 4 ; Jer. vi. 17 ; Ezek. iii. 17, xxxiii. 7). This office of watchman, moreover, was to be exercised both toward the nation in general and the holders of theocratic offices in particular, especially the king, whose conduct could not on theocratic principles be inspected and controlled by the representatives of the people, but only by the immediate agents of Jehovah. To try the ways of the nation and its leaders by their conformity to the injunctions of the Divine covenant (comp. as the principal passage Jer. vi. 27)—to insist with inexorable severity upon the dignity and sole sovereignty of Jehovah—to testify unreservedly before high and low, and especially before the theocratic office-bearers, against every declension from Him and from His law—to proclaim the Divine judgments against the obdurately disobedient, and to be in some circumstances themselves the executioners thereof, and on the other hand, to promise, when needful, deliverance and blessing, such were the duties which constituted the political agency of the

prophets,—an agency which must be classed, neither with that of ministers and councillors of state, nor with that of popular leaders and demagogues, in the fashion in which it has often been attempted to draw a comparison between them. One duty pertaining to this office of watchman was that of *writing the theocratic history*, whose object it was to portray, in the light of the Divine counsels and of the inviolable ordinance of Divine retribution, the manner in which Israel had hitherto been led—to pass judgment on the past condition of the people, and especially on the life and conduct of their kings, according to the standard of the law—to point out by their fate the reality of the Divine threats and promises; and in all these ways to hold up, for the warning and comfort of future generations, the mirror of the history of their forefathers; the so-called "theocratic pragmatism" (6).

(1) Compare on this subject especially Keil's *Commentary on the Books of Samuel*, 1864, § 146 sqq. There is scarcely any subject of Old Testament history and theology which could formerly boast of having excited so large a share of interest and investigation as the so-called schools of the prophets. The less that was known of them, the more might be made of them, and hence every one saw in them what he wanted to see. The copious literature to which they have given rise is recorded in Kranichfeld, *De iis, quæ in V. T. commemorantur, prophetarum societatibus*, 1861, p. 2. [On the various views in regard to their time and origin, comp. the art. "Prophetenthum des A. T." in Herzog. Of the latest investigations may be mentioned that of König, i. p. 46 sqq., for the sake of the distinction which he draws between mediate and immediate prophecy, in support of which he brings into account the schools of the prophets.]

(2) Similar extraordinary phenomena are recorded also of the oldest Christian churches, especially that in Corinth (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 24); the Camisards and other phenomena of ecclesiastical history may here be mentioned.

(3) In the very variously understood passage, 1 Sam. x. 12, the words "who is their father?" can hardly be taken to mean "who is their president?" which would here be a very idle inquiry. They are rather to be regarded as a retort to the astonished inquiry of ver. 11, "what is come to the son of Kish?" which they answer by the question, "who then is *their* father?" *i.e.* have they then the gift of prophecy in virtue of a privilege of birth?

(4) It is, however, undoubtedly probable that the cultivation of sacred music by the prophets mainly contributed to the impulse given to it from the time of David, who was closely connected with the association of prophets at Ramah, and even, according to 1 Sam. xix. 18, himself sojourned there for a time. There is so close a connection between sacred song and prophecy, that the former is itself called prophesying, 1 Chron. xxv. 2 sq.; and the chief singers appointed by David (xxv. 1, 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 30, xxxv. 15) are called prophets and seers.

(5) Comp. 1 Chron. xxix. 29, and what Thenius, on 1 Sam. xix. 19, xxii. 5, remarks on the traces of sketches of the life of David made in the schools of the prophets. The foundations of that great historical work composed during successive centuries by the prophets, so frequently appealed to as an authority in the Books of Kings, and, though re-compiled, still extant in the time of the Chronicler, may have been already laid. With respect to the disputed question—which cannot in this place be further discussed—as to the relation of the writings quoted in the Books of Chronicles under the names of prophets (the words of the seer Samuel, of the prophet Nathan, of the seer Gad, the prophecy of Ahijah, the visions of Iddo the seer, the words of the prophet Shemaiah, the writing of Isaiah, etc.) to the above-mentioned annals, it seems to me that the former must have been in the hands of the Chronicler not as separate writings, but as component parts of the latter great work, which is expressly stated to have been the case with the writings of the prophets Jehu and Isaiah, 2 Chron. xx. 34, xxxii.

32. The theory of Movers and others, however, that individual portions of the Books of Kings are designated in Chronicles by the names of prophets, as above cited, only because narratives concerning the prophets in question occur in them, is unnatural. Rather does the Chronicler, as he unmistakably says, 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, with respect to the history of Uzziah by Isaiah, regard the books on which his own work is founded as the actual compositions of prophets. The connection between the writing of history and the prophetic call will become more evident as we proceed.

(6) An expression quite harmless in itself, yet capable of leading to a total misconception, if the view of history imparted to the prophets in virtue of that spiritual vision which disclosed to them the connection of things, is represented as the result of a talent for so representing events as to accommodate history to subjective tendencies.

§ 163.

The Foundation of the Israelitish Kingdom. Consecration of the King (1).

We have already glanced at the duty made incumbent on those who filled the office of prophets, by *the founding of the Israelitish kingdom.* This took place in the following manner. In spite of the mutual jealousies of the different tribes, among which that of Ephraim laid special claim to superiority (comp. Judg. viii. 1, xii. 1), the troubles experienced during the times of the judges had made the people conscious of their need of a national union, by which the several tribes might be bound together. The royal dignity, with hereditary succession, had already been offered to Gideon, and refused by him on theocratic principles, Judg. viii. 23 (2). After his death, a kingdom was set up "over Israel," ix. 22, in Shechem, by his illegitimate son Abimelech, which, however, extended to only a portion of the nation, and lasted but three years. The people having at last experienced under Samuel the advantages of national unity, and fearing the dangers still threatening them from east and west (in the first place from the Ammonites, but also, comp. ix. 16, still from the Philistines), and at the same time apprehensive of the tyranny of Samuel's sons, expressed still more strongly their desire for a king, on whom the command of the army and the administration of justice might regularly devolve,—a king "like all the nations," viii. 5, 20. This request, in the sense in which it was made to Samuel, was a denial of the sovereignty of Jehovah, a renunciation of their own glory as the theocratic people, and a misconception of the power and faithfulness of the covenant God, inasmuch as a faulty constitution, and not their own departure from God and His law, was regarded as the cause of the misfortunes they had hitherto experienced; while their hope of a better future was therefore founded upon the institution of an earthly government, and not upon the return of the people to their God. Hence the Divine answer, viii. 7, "they have rejected *me* that I should not reign over them." On the other hand, however, as the Divine providence does not exclude the employment of human agents as its instruments, so neither was an earthly kingdom of necessity opposed to the theocracy; nay, since the people had shown themselves incapable of uniting in an ideal union, the kingship might—if the king, in obedience to the theocratic principle, were regarded not as an autocrat but as the organ of Jehovah—even become the means of confirming the theocracy. It was on this principle that Samuel acted, after having obtained God's permission to grant the desire of the people. To make it evident

that the Divine choice was entirely independent of earthly considerations, it was not a man of importance, but one as yet unknown, of the least family of the smallest of the tribes (ix. 21), who was raised to the throne (3). The consecration to the kingship was effected, according to ancient and recognized (Judg. ix. 8, 15) usage, by *anointing*, a rite performed by Samuel on Saul, 1 Sam. x. 1, and subsequently on David, xvi. 3, and repeated in the case of the latter after his actual entrance upon the government, 2 Sam. ii. 4, v. 3, by the elders of the people. The royal anointing is also mentioned in the cases of Absalom, xix. 11; Solomon, 1 Kings i. 39 (by the high priest); Joash, 2 Kings ix. 12; Jehoahaz, xxiii. 30; and, in the kingdom of the ten tribes, in the case of Jehu, who was raised to the throne by the instrumentality of a prophet. The anointing of a king is nowhere else spoken of,—a circumstance which has given support to the Rabbinic view, that this rite was only practised at the elevation of a new dynasty, or when an exceptional case of succession occurred, but omitted when the succession was regular (4). If this view is correct, anointing must be regarded as a rite the efficacy of which continued as long as the regular succession to the throne was uninterrupted. And this is undoubtedly consistent with the Old Testament idea of the connection of the dynasty with its founder,—מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה, the Lord's anointed, being the usual designation of the theocratic king (comp. such passages as Ps. xx. 7, xxviii. 10, lxxxix. 39, 51, etc.). Anointing was a symbol of endowment with the Divine Spirit (comp. 1 Sam. x. 1 in connection with ver. 9 sq., xvi. 13), the gift which is the condition of a wise, just, and powerful government,—all ability to rule righteously being but an outflow of Divine wisdom (Prov. viii. 15 sq.) Anointing made the king's person both sacred and inviolable (1 Sam. xxiv. 7, xxvi. 9, compared with 2 Sam. ix. 22). In Saul's case, his investment with the regal functions, by his public presentation before the assembled people, 1 Sam. x. 20 sqq., on which occasion Samuel announced to them "the manner of the kingdom," and wrote it in a book which was laid up before the Lord, *i.e.* deposited with the Tora in the sanctuary, did not take place till after his consecration. What Samuel explained to the people as "the manner of the king," in viii. 11 sqq., is not meant here (as the passage has so frequently been misunderstood), for the latter was just what the people desired, viz., that he should be "like the kings of the heathen nations" (5). We afterward find, 2 Kings xi. 12, that a copy of the law was, in accordance with the injunction Deut. xvii. 18 sq., presented to the king together with the crown. Saul having by a victory over the Ammonites obtained the recognition of the people (ch. xi.), Samuel retired from the office of judge, to execute from henceforth only the duties of prophet, and of watchman of the theocracy.

(1) See my article "Könige, Königthum in Israel" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* viii. p. 10 sq. [Diestel, art. "Königthum" in Riehm].

(2) Judg. viii. 23: "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: the Lord shall rule over you."

(3) A similar mode of proceeding was observed at the choice of David, 1 Sam. xvi. 7, comp. with 2 Sam. vii. 8, 18, Ps. lxxviii. 70.

(4) Comp. the still very useful work of Schickard, *Jus regium Hebræorum c. animadvers. J. B. Carpzovii*, 1674, p. 77; J. G. Carpzov, *App. hist. crit. ant. sacr.* p. 56.

(5) Neither, however, can a constitution in the modern sense of the word, or a compact between ruler and people, be supposed.

SECOND DIVISION.

PERIOD OF THE UNDIVIDED KINGDOM.

I. SAUL.

§ 164.

The history of Israel during the time of the undivided kingdom is separated by the *reigns of its three kings into three sections*, essentially differing in character.

The reign of *Saul* at once displays the *kingdom in conflict with the theocratic principle* maintained by the prophets. Saul fell a victim to his efforts to render the kingdom independent [of divine restraint], though at the commencement of his reign he seems undoubtedly to have supported the reforming zeal of Samuel, by his extermination of necromancy (1 Sam. xxviii. 9). He regarded his royal office chiefly, however, on its *warlike* side, which the dangers constantly menacing him on the part of the Philistines never suffered him to lose sight of (1 Sam. xiii. 8–14) (1). That his submission to the prophet was not unlimited, was shown by even the first test imposed upon him by Samuel, viz. that of waiting seven days before the sacrifice (1 Sam. xiii. 8–14, compared with x. 8,) on which account Samuel announced to him that his kingdom should not endure (2). Ignoring, nevertheless, the evident consistency with which the prophet treated him, and transgressing his command for the second time after his victorious contest with the Amalekites, ch. xv., against whom he failed to execute the *Herem*, the Divine sentence of rejection was immediately pronounced against him. The answer then given by Samuel, ver. 22 sq., to the king, when he sought to palliate his disobedience, contains what may be called the programme of prophetship, which, as the office of the Spirit, was to censure all hypocrisy, and to advocate, in opposition to all self-righteousness, the sole supremacy of the Divine will (3). In the execution of his office, the prophet was not permitted to yield to that human sympathy with which Samuel personally regarded Saul (see xv. 11, xvi. 1). From this time forward Saul was gradually but certainly approaching the consummation of his tragic fate. Samuel anointed the shepherd David, the youngest son of Jesse, a descendant of Ruth the Moabitess,—who, as a convert from heathenism, had been incorporated into the covenant people (Ruth iv. 22),—king in his stead. Samuel seems after this to have retired into the seclusion of the association of prophets at Ramah. The prophets held no further intercourse with Saul: David was now in their eyes the lawful king, and with him, as appears from 1 Sam. xxii. 5, they associated as far as practicable (4). Saul, however, utterly consumed his strength in persecuting David and all whom he regarded as his adherents. His whole existence was embittered by suspicion of those about him, till at length the unhappy king, after seeking counsel from the shades of the dead, and receiving as a sentence from the mouth of the departed, that prophetic testimony which he had despised when announced by the living, perished by his own hand, after an unsuccessful battle against the Philistines (5).

(1) 1 Sam. xiv. 52: "When Saul saw any strong man, or any valiant man, he took him unto him."

(2) I cannot here enter into particulars; comp. the elucidation of this point in Ewald's *History of Israel*, iii. p. 29 sqq., and the whole of his excellent treatment of the reign of Saul, which is one of the best portions of that work.

(3) 1 Sam. xv. 22 sq.: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams: for rebellion is the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He hath also rejected thee from being king."

(4) The prophet *Gad*, mentioned 1 Sam. xxii. 5, and subsequently reappearing in the history of David, was probably a member of the association of prophets at Ramah.

(5) The narrative in the First Book of Samuel, how Saul after being forsaken of God, advanced step by step to his tragical end, and the Books of Samuel in general, are the most complete portion of Old Testament history; while the vivid and graphic descriptions, and the sharpness and delicacy with which the chief characters are portrayed, are excellent even in an artistic point of view. On the subject last mentioned, comp. especially the article "Die Geschichte von der Zauberin in Endor" in the *Erlanger Zeitschrift für Protest. und Kirche*, 1851, September, p. 133 sqq. Saul is there very justly characterized as of "a demoniac nature, quickly rushing from one extreme to another, enthusiastic in pleasure, deeply depressed in sorrow, and finally sinking beneath the waves of despair."

II. DAVID.

§ 165.

History of his Reign, his Theocratic Position and Personal Religious Development.

It was only by the tribe of Judah, to which he belonged, that David was at first acknowledged king. The other tribes still adhered to the house of Saul; and even after the murder of Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, this division of the state continued for several years. David had reigned seven and a half years in Hebron before he received the submission of all Israel in a form in which the theocratic principle was expressly recognized (2 Sam. v. 2 sqq.) (1). Thus began the powerful reign of David, during which, by a series of successful wars, he rendered the kingdom of Israel not only independent of foreign domination, but even extended its northern and eastern boundary to the Euphrates, and raised himself to a position of power which inspired other nations with fear (comp. Ps. xviii. 44 sq.). Thus the kingship of David becomes the type of the kingdom of God which overcomes the world (2). Israel, however, as the people of God, was not to realize its vocation to the rulership of the world, which is indeed the aim of the theocracy (Ps. ii.), in the way of a conquering secular state; hence the condemnation of that *numbering of the people* instituted by David (2 Sam. xxiv.; 1 Chron. xxi.), which was probably designed to lead to the complete military organization of the nation (3). This occurrence, in which the prophet Gad was conspicuous, and the appearance of Nathan in the well-known case (2 Sam. xii.), show that the prophets were mindful of their office as watchmen and reprovers of the king, even under David (4). In general, however, we now see *the two offices exercised harmoniously*. For David was himself filled with the idea of a theocratic ruler: his life and acts were founded on the one thought of being found as the servant of Jehovah, the God who had chosen him and taken him from the sheepfolds to feed His chosen people (Ps. lxxviii. 70–72). This is evi-

dent in several of his psalms,—in that mirror of kings, Ps. ci., in which he portrays a sovereign as a righteous judge, and in the song of thanksgiving, Ps. xviii., which, after being victorious over all his enemies, he sang unto the God who had girded him with strength for the conflict, and subdued the nations under him (5). The union of the kingship with the Divine rulership, in virtue of which the king was settled in Jehovah's house and kingdom, 1 Chron. xvii. 14 ("I will settle him in *my* house and in *my* kingdom"),—sat upon the throne of the kingdom of Jehovah, xxviii. 5, xxix. 23, (more briefly: "upon the throne of God"),—was externally effected when the hill of Zion, which after the conquest of Jerusalem had been chosen as the seat of government, was also made the seat of the sanctuary by the installation of the ark of the covenant (2 Sam. vi.), which was now again brought out of concealment. For although sacrificial services were still performed in the old tabernacle, which was at the high place at Gibeon (1 Chron. xvi. 37–42, comp. 2 Chron. i. 3 sqq.), yet the hill of Zion, as the dwelling-place of Jehovah, Ps. ix. 12, lxxiv. 2, lxxvi. 3, lxxviii. 68, was from this time forth the centre of the theocracy. Thence proceeded, according to Ps. iii. 5, xx. 3, cx. 2, and other passages, the manifestations of God's grace and power; while every hope of the glorification and perfection of the Divine kingdom is connected with Jerusalem, the city of God, xlvi. 5, the city of the great King, (Jehovah) xlviii. 3, the foundations of which are upon the holy hills, lxxxvii. 1, and which, in its strong, retired, and protected situation, is itself a symbol of the church of God, cxxv. 1 sq., and of which all the nations of the earth are one day to receive the rights of citizenship, Ps. lxxxvii. (6). The *kingship*, as administered by David, appears neither as a necessary evil nor an improved constitution, but as a new ethical power. In its king, Israel itself attains to a consciousness of its national dignity; hence the king becomes also the representative of the people; and the idea of *Divine sonship*, which in the first place appertains to the people, is transferred to him (7). Kingship in the person of David (and relatively in that of Solomon) exhibits also a certain measure of the *priestly character;* for David appeared for the people before the Lord with sacrifices and intercessions, and brought back to them the Lord's blessing, 2 Sam. vi. 18 (8). It is a peculiarity of David, like Moses and Samuel, that to a certain degree he *unites in himself the three theocratic dignities;* for the gift of *prophecy* also was bestowed on him, the Spirit of God spoke by him, and the words of God were on his tongue, 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. Of the greatest importance, however, was the choice of David to be, in the persons of his descendants, *the permanent holder of the theocratic kingship*, in virtue of that Divine *promise* delivered to him by Nathan, which forms a new stage in the history of the kingdom of God. When David had rest from his enemies round about him, he announced to the prophet Nathan his intention of building a temple as a permanent dwelling-place for Jehovah. Nathan at first agreed with him, but received in the night direction from God to bid David renounce this undertaking, on account, as we are told 1 Chron. xxii. 8, xxviii. 3, of the blood which, as a warrior, he had shed. It seemed inconsistent with Divine decorum that this work of peace should be executed by hands so defiled with blood. That son of David whom God had chosen to be His son was to be called to accomplish it. On the other hand, God promised to build David a house, to bestow the

kingship on his seed for ever, and though chastisements might not be omitted, never to withdraw His favor from him (see the commentary on this passage in Ps. lxxxix. 20–28). In the history of revelation, the eternal covenant of God with David and his seed now enters as a new element (comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5); the full manifestation of the kingdom of God being henceforth combined with the realization of the "sure mercies of David," Isa. lv. 3, comp. with Ps. lxxxix. 50; and thus upon the foundation of the theocratic notion of kingship arose the prophecy of its antitypical perfection in the Messiah (9).

It is not, however, solely in virtue of his theocratic position, but also by reason of *his personal religious development*, that David is an important character in the history of the Old Testament. The *contrast between sin and grace*, which it is the object of the pædagogy of the law to bring to light, appeared in all its sharpness in his inner life; and that life brings to view, as its external course advanced in a state of continual conflict, both the deep degradation of the fallen, sin-burdened man, and the elevation of a spirit richly endowed with Divine grace. To a greater degree than any other Old Testament character, he experienced the restlessness and desolation of a soul burdened with the consciousness of guilt, the longing after reconciliation with God, the struggle after purity and renovation of heart, the joy of forgiven sin, the heroic, all-conquering power of confidence in God, the ardent love of a gracious heart for God; and has given in his *Psalms* imperishable testimony as to what is the fruit of the law and what the fruit of faith in man. And in saying this, we have touched upon that particular in which David most powerfully affected the spiritual life of his people. It was in him, the sweet singer of Israel, as he is called 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, that *sacred lyric poetry* attained its climax in Israel. Sacred song, which, to judge by existing specimens, had previously manifested more an objectively epic that a subjectively lyric character, had indeed been cultivated in Israel from the earliest times (as was shown § 105, note 10, and § 113); but it was not till after it had been elevated by David into an essential element of worship (on which see the next §), and the people had received from him and other poets of his times a copious supply of sacred songs, that they could duly learn how to bring before God in music and song the joy and grief, the hope and fear, the prayer and praise that moved their inmost heart. It is impossible to rate too highly the treasure that Israel possessed in the Psalms, that copy-book of the saints, as Luther called them; nor can it be doubted that it was chiefly by means of the Psalms that the word of God dwelt in the homes of Israel, and that the knowledge of the sacred history was kept up among the people. (§ 105, note 10.)

(1) In 2 Sam. v. 2 the people express—in perfect accordance with Deut. xvii. 15—their acknowledgment of the Divine call of David: "Jehovah said unto thee, Thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be ruler over Israel;" and David hereupon concludes a covenant before Jehovah, with the people as represented by their elders. The expression בְּרִית . . . וַיִּכְרֹת לָהֶם, ver. 3, involving the notion that the two contracting parties had not equal rights (comp. § 80 above), should be observed.

(2) Hence all the attributes of the latter are ascribed to him: he is destined to subdue the heathen (Ps. xviii. 44, 48); his dominion is to extend to the end of the earth (ii. 8, comp. lxxii. 8, etc.), and is of continual and eternal duration (2 Sam. vii. 16, xxiii. 5), etc. (Art. "Könige in Israel.")

(3) See on this narrative § 200, and Ewald in the 10th *Jahrbuch der bibl. Wissenschaft*, p. 34 sqq.

(4) When Gad is called David's seer, 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, 1 Chron. xxi. 9, there is no reference to any special official position at court, in the sense in which court prophets have been spoken of as a kind of king's privy councillors. The independence of the prophetic office is shown by the fact that there is no mention of prophets in those passages in which the officials of David and Solomon are enumerated (2 Sam. viii. 16, xx. 23; 1 Chron. xxvii. 32 sqq.; 1 Kings iv. 2 sqq.), though even the high priests appear in these lists of royal functionaries (art. "Prophetenthum des A. T.").

(5) Hence in the history of the kings of Israel, all the successors of David are judged of according to their conformity to his example; nothing higher can be said of them than that they walked in the ways of David.

(6) On the importance of the situation of Jerusalem, see Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xvi. p. 297: "Jerusalem, built in the middle of Judea, away from the great roads of communication with the East, protected and cut off from the rest of the world,—on the east by the Wilderness of the Dead Sea, on the north and west by the most difficult mountain-passes of Syria and the Mediterranean Sea, on the south by the deserts of Edom extending far beyond Hebron, and the plains of undulating sands spread out before Egypt,—itself standing on high rocky ground, without rich plains, almost without arable fields, without a river, nay, almost without natural springs or depth of soil,—this Jerusalem has nevertheless acquired an importance among capitals with which only that of Rome and Constantinople in the West can be compared." Ps. cxxv. 1: "They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever. As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about His people from henceforth, even for ever."

(7) Comp. § 82. 1. The theocratic king is the *son of God*, the first-born among the kings of the earth (2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. xxix. 27 sq., comp. ii. 7). By sonship to God is expressed chiefly the relation of love and faithfulness in which God stands to the ruler of His people. The significance of sonship must not, however, (as Hengstenberg, on Ps. ii. 7, thinks), be limited to this; but the term further implies that the theocratic king is in this capacity begotten of God (comp. Ps. ii. 7), that his dignity is of Divine origin, his sovereignty a reflection of the Divine glory (comp. Ps. xxi. 4, 6). In like manner the judges of the people are also called gods, and sons of the Highest (comp. § 98), because their office originates in the judicial authority of God. (Art. "Könige in Israel.")

(8) Comp. also 1 Chron. xxix. 10; 1 Kings viii. 14, 55. This was done, however, without trenching upon the special duties of the priesthood. For the assistance of the priests was not excluded from the sacrifices of kings, 2 Sam. vi. 17; 1 Kings iii. 4; 2 Chron. i. 6; 1 Kings viii. 62 sqq., ix. 25; nor is it anywhere said that David and Solomon performed *with their own hands* the sacrificial functions allotted by the law to the priests. (See above art.)

(9) [In connection with his view of David's character, which rests upon an undue prominence given to its dark side, Reuss (comp. especially § 156 sq. 159.) denies the Davidic composition of *all* the Psalms. He cannot understand how in uncultivated men belonging to a rude age, with its low standard of morality, religious depth and inwardness together with moral nobleness can coexist with low ethical views which a fuller culture must condemn, and with outbreaks of unbridled passion. The historian Ranke (*Weltgeschichte*, i. p. 59 sq.), though perhaps not far removed from Reuss in his position in regard to Scripture and revelation, has estimated the character and conduct of David more justly than the theologian. What Diestel (art. "David" in Riehm), Orelli (in Herzog, 2d ed. iii. p. 521 sqq.), and Köhler (ii. 186 sqq.) have urged against the picture of David given by Duncker and Seinecke, refutes in part the view presented by Reuss, against which the remarks of F. W. Schultz (in Zöckler, i. 273 sq.) are more expressly directed, who says, among other things: "To doubt that David as a Psalmist gave expression to his best and holiest feelings, and that as such he subsequently

had a special care for the enrichment of public worship, is possible only for him who mistakes the religious standpoint of the monarch and his people at the time. If Reuss thinks that scarce anything but songs of heroes and victory and love would have swept across the chords of his harp, he has simply changed the Israelitish lion of God into a medieval knight."]

§ 166.

The Form of Worship under David (1).

The building of the temple which David was not suffered to accomplish, was at all events prepared for by this monarch. For it is evident from 2 Sam. viii. 11 that he accumulated considerable *treasures for the sanctuary*, by dedicating to the Lord all the gold, silver, and other booty which he took in his wars. The numerical statements of 1 Chron. xxii. are evidently excessive ; but Ewald is certainly in the right when he remarks, that unless Solomon on entering upon the government had found considerable treasures, he could not so quickly have commenced the work of building. David, moreover, manifested *an active zeal for public worship*, which manifested itself, in the first place, with respect to the organization of the priesthood. The narrative in 1 Sam. xxii. 10, according to which Saul caused eighty-five priests to be put to death in one day at Nob, shows that the number of the priests must have considerably increased during the period of the judges. *Zadok* of the line of Eleazar, and *Abiathar* of the line of Ithamar, great-grandson of Eli according to Jewish tradition, appear contemporaneously as high priests during the time of David (2 Sam. xx. 25) (2). Zadok being, according to 1 Chron. xvi. 39, stationed at the tabernacle at Gibeon, Abiathar must have officiated in the sacred tent in which was the ark of the covenant at Jerusalem (3). David now regularly organized *the priestly service*, by dividing the priests into twenty-four classes (מַחְלְקוֹת), of which sixteen belonged to the line of Eleazar and eight to that of Ithamar, 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, comp. with 2 Chron. viii. 14, xxxv. 4 sqq. Each class had a president at its head ; these were the שָׂרֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים, xxxvi. 14, Ezra x. 5, or רָאשֵׁי הַכֹּהֲנִים (LXX ἄρχοντες τῶν ἱερέων), Neh. xii. 7, called also שָׂרֵי קֹדֶשׁ, 1 Chron. xxiv. 5 (comp. Isa. xliii. 28). Each class had to officiate for a week, viz. from Sabbath to Sabbath, 2 Chron. xxiii. 4. The order of the classes was determined by lot ; see 1 Chron. xxiv. (4). David also organized the service of the *Levites*. Opportunity for using this was chiefly afforded him by the introduction of music into public worship, in which, according to the supplementary notice, 2 Chron. xxix. 25, he is said to have followed the Divine directions delivered to him by the prophets *Gad* and *Nathan*. By this service of song, by which words as well as acts were made prominent in public worship, the spirituality of the temple service was increased,—the matter of some of the psalms being, moreover, directed against a dead externalism in Divine worship. This is manifest even on the first occasion on which David gave directions with respect to music in public worship, viz. *at the bringing up of the ark to Mount Zion* (1 Chron. xiii. 2, ch. xv. sq., comp. with vi. 16 sqq.), when David, as we are told 1 Chron. xv. 16, commanded the chiefs of the Levites "to appoint their brethren the singers, with stringed instruments, harps, and lutes, and cymbals, to sing aloud and lift up the voice with joy." For Ps. xxiv. was

undoubtedly composed upon this festive occasion; and its teaching is, that the God who now so graciously condescends to make His entrance into Zion with the ark of the covenant, is the Creator and Lord of the earth, the ruler of the hosts of heaven, and that he only may venture to approach Him in His holy place, who has clean hands and a pure heart, who has not lifted up his soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. Nor less do we recognize in others of the most ancient psalms respecting the sanctuary on Zion (*e.g.* Ps. xv. and the magnificent song of Asaph, Ps. l.) the echo of the prophetic words, 1 Sam. xv. 22 (see above, § 164 and note 3). According to 1 Chron. xvi. 37 sqq., Asaph and his kinsmen were appointed singers, and the Jeduthunites, Obed-edom and Hosah and their kinsmen, door-keepers before the ark at Jerusalem; and Heman and Jeduthun singers, and the sons of Jeduthun doorkeepers, at the tabernacle at Gibeon. Toward the close of his life, David, with a view to the needs of the future temple, arranged a more complete organization of Levitical services (1 Chron. xxiii. sq.), dividing (ver. 3) the 38,000 Levites who were at that time thirty years old and upward (5) into *four classes*, three of whom had charge of the service of the sanctuary, viz. 1*st*, the servants of the priests (24,000); 2*d*, singers and musicians (4000); 3*d*, door-keepers (4000); to the fourth class, (6000) called officers and judges, was delivered the care of external affairs (הַמְּלָאכָה הַחִיצוֹנָה, xxvi. 29) (16). The first class (7) was subdivided into twenty-four courses corresponding with the twenty-four classes of priests, the descendants of Gershon constituting six, those of Kohath nine, and those of Merari nine courses; the class of singers and minstrels (xxv. 9 sqq.) into twenty-four bands, each of which had a president and eleven masters of the same family at its head (8). The service of the doorkeepers was organized in military fashion, the idea of the camp of Jehovah in the wilderness being transferred to the sanctuary, ix. 19; 2 Chron. xxxi. 2. It is self-evident that the arrangements instituted by David could not be fully carried out till the completion of the temple by Solomon, as is indeed expressly stated 2 Chron. viii. 14 sq. (9). The class of servants to the priests was assisted in the lower kinds of service by the so-called *Nethinim*. The temple servants (*ἱερόδουλοι*, Joseph. *Antiq.* xi. 5. 1 sq.), who were probably, comp. Aben Ezra on Ezra ii. 43, originally the descendants of the *Gibeonites*, whom Joshua, according to Josh. ix. 27, made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation and for the altar for all times (10), are so called in the post-Babylonian books (1 Chron. ix. 2; Ezra vii. 24, etc.). To this race, however, which must have been considerably diminished by the bloody persecution raised against it for some unknown cause by Saul (2 Sam. xxi. 1), were added, in consideration of the necessities of the increased service, servants presented by David and the princes for the use of the sanctuary (Ezra viii. 20), *i.e.* probably slaves acquired in war, and also, according to ii. 58, Neh. vii. 60, xi. 3, sons of the servants of Solomon, *i.e.* descendants of the Canaanite vassals already mentioned, § 111. The name נְתִינִים (*i.e. traditi*, comp. נְתֻנִים, Num. viii. 19) finds its explanation, Ezra viii. 20, שֶׁנָּתַן דָּוִיד וְהַשָּׂרִים לַעֲבֹדַת הַלְוִיִּם (whom David and his princes *gave* for the service of the Levites) (11).

(1) The present section must be viewed as a continuation of what was said in § 93 sq. on the Priesthood and Leviteship (comp. also § 158). [Comp. also the articles "Hoherpriester," "Levi, Leviten," "Nethinim," "Priesterthum im A. T." in Herzog. Reuss and the critics who agree with him assume in advance

the Books of Chronicles to be unhistorical: "A later generation took the liberty to attribute to David the best of what was first done by his son for the splendor of the worship of Jehovah, and even by the priesthood, who after the overthrow of the kingdom introduced various institutions of caste and temple service."]

(2) Comp. § 158. According to 2 Sam. viii. 17, 1 Chron. xviii. 16, xxiv. 3, 6, Zadok appears on an equality with Ahimelech the son of Abiathar. Bertheau's view of 1 Chron. xviii. 16, which makes Abiathar have a son, Ahimelech, who performed the priestly functions in conjunction with his father, obviates the gross confusion arising from the ordinary view. (Art. "Hoherpriester.")

(3) It is indeed possible that in pre-Davidic times, and during the disintegration of the theocracy, priests of both lines may have jointly performed high-priestly functions. The statement of Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 1. 3), that the priests of the line of Phinehas (*i.e.* Eleazar) lived in a private condition, while the line of Ithamar was in possession of the high-priestly dignity, must be regarded as a mere conjecture (see art. cited).

(4) In opposition to the view of Herzfeld (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel vor der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels*, i. p. 381 sqq.), who regards the reference of this organization of the priesthood to David as an invention of the Chronicler, we would only here mention that we have, in Ezek. viii. 16-18, an evident trace of this division of the priests in pre-Babylonian times; for those twenty-five men worshipping the sun, who from their location could be none but priests, must, as expositors since Lightfoot correctly suppose, be the high priest and the heads of the twenty-four priestly orders. How this institution was subsequently developed, see the article quoted, p. 185 sq.

(5) While the above passages presuppose thirty years of age as the period at which official duties were to begin, 1 Chron. xxiii. 25 sqq. tells us that the enactment that the functions of the Levites were to begin at their twentieth year—an enactment made in consideration of the circumstance that, since the transference of the sanctuary to Jerusalem, the bearing of the tabernacle and its vessels had ceased, and the service had thus been lightened—is to be attributed to David. On the relation of this passage to those cited above, see Bertheau *in loc.* The twentieth year was henceforth adopted as the *terminus a quo;* comp. 2 Chron. xxi. 17, Ezra iii. 8.

(6) The functions assigned to those classes at least who served at the sanctuary, seem for the most part to have been hereditary in the same families.

(7) These also seem to have merely borne the name לְוִיִּם, comp. Neh. xiii. 5, xii. 47; yet see, on the other hand, 1 Chron. ix. 14, where the musicians are called simply Levites. They assisted the priests in the offices enumerated in the 23d, 28th sq., and 31st sq. verses. See particulars in the article quoted, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* viii. p. 355.

(8) The share of the congregation in the musical service of the sanctuary seems to have been generally limited to saying Amen and praising the Lord (comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 36), which latter refers to such doxological formulæ as "Hallelujah," "O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is gracious," etc., and the like (comp. Jer. xxxiii. 11). On the other hand, psalms were sung by the people themselves in festal processions (comp. Ps. lxviii. 26 sq.), and on the occasion of their pilgrimages to the sanctuary; for which latter purpose fifteen of the Psalms (Ps. cxx.–cxxxiv.), according to the most probable explanation of their titles, combine to form a special group. Some of these psalms are certainly of later origin, but the great antiquity of the custom is confirmed by Isa. xxx. 29. The last-named passage shows that such songs were especially connected with the celebration of the Passover (compare § 153 on the later ritual).

(9) That these arrangements, as above described, actually existed in the pre-Babylonian temple, and were in all essential points introduced by Solomon, cannot on adequate grounds be disputed (comp. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, iii. p. 248). For where in succeeding centuries could a period be found to which the reorganization of the Levitical orders could be reasonably assigned?

(10) Deut. xxix. 10 has induced some to transfer the origin of the Nethinim to the Mosaic period, though this passage does but speak in a general manner of the strangers in the Israelite camp, upon whom the lowest services were imposed.

(11) All these were undoubtedly bound to observe the Mosaic law, for would the uncircumcised have been suffered in the sanctuary? At all events, this was certainly the case in post-Babylonian times, Neh. x. 29 sq.

III. SOLOMON.

§ 167.

The Building of the Temple.

The first fulfilment of the promise given to David (comp. 1 Kings viii. 20) appeared in Solomon, the son of Bathsheba, who (according to 2 Sam. xii. 25) was educated by the prophet Nathan, and raised mainly by his influence to the throne, in opposition to the claims of his elder brother Adonijah. During a long period of peace, undisturbed till towards the close of his long reign, and living in the memory of the people as a type of the Divine peace of Messianic times (comp. with 1 Kings v. 5, iv. 25, the prophetic passages Mic. iv. 4, Zech. viii. 10 sqq.), he enjoyed the glory which the wars of his father had obtained for the kingdom.

Among Solomon's works, the *temple* (1) offers special matter for consideration with respect to biblical theology. It was seven years in building, and stood upon the plateau of Moriah (2), enlarged for the purpose by foundations to an extent of 80,000 square cubits. It was thus built on the very spot on which David, in conformity with the directions of the prophet Gad, had formerly reared an altar (2 Chron. iii. 1, comp. with 2 Sam. xxiv. 18). The *description of the temple* given 1 Kings vi. sq. is evidently derived from a document compiled by an eye-witness, though the text seems in some few instances to have been incorrectly transmitted. The account in 2 Chron. iii. sq. differs in some respects, and is not free from difficulties. The description of the new temple Ezek. xl.–xlii. must be cautiously used in elucidation; for though the visional delineation of the priestly prophet is founded upon the image of the old temple, yet the latter is idealized, and even altered in some particulars, to suit the predicted forms of worship. Josephus, too (*Antiq.* viii. 3), who frequently follows the leadings of his imagination, can only be appealed to with caution. The proportions of the tabernacle were in all essential respects followed in the *temple building*, בֵּית יְהוָֹה, which was constructed of hewn stone. The dimensions were, however, doubled,—the temple being, according to 1 Kings vi. 2, sixty cubits long, twenty wide, and thirty high (3). It was divided into *two parts*, of which the foremost, called in the stricter sense הֵיכָל, was forty cubits long; the hindmost, the holy of holies, called דְּבִיר, twenty cubits long and as many high and broad, thus forming a cube (4). According to this statement, the temple would be externally ten cubits lower at the holy of holies than at the holy place, just as in Egyptian temples the *sanctuarium* is lower than the temple itself, and in Christian churches the choir lower than the nave. This is, however, generally doubted; and עֲלִיּוֹת, *i.e. upper chambers*, being mentioned 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, 2 Chron. iii. 9, it is supposed either that these were over the holy of holies, or (as by Kurtz and Merz) that the holy place also was only twenty cubits high, and that these upper chambers extended over the whole length

of the building (5). The interior of the temple was overlaid with wood, upon which were representations in carved work of cherubim, palms, and flower cups. Before the east side of the temple was a *porch*, אוּלָם, the whole breadth of the house, and therefore twenty cubits long and ten wide. Its height is not stated in 1 Kings vi., but 2 Chron. iii. 4 declares it to have been 120 cubits, a height which cannot be justified by referring to the propylæ of Egyptian temples, and which, on such a foundation and before such an edifice, was impossible. There can be no doubt that we have here, as is frequently the case in Chronicles, a textual error ; and a height of twenty (Movers reads עֶשְׂרִים), or more correctly of thirty cubits, is now generally accepted. Before this porch, according to the ordinary view, but within it, according to 1 Kings vii. 19, stood two colossal columns of brass, called *Jachin and Boaz* (יָכִין, בֹּעַז), adorned with castings of lilies, network, and pomegranates, vii. 15–22, comp. with 2 Kings xxv. 16 sq., and having capitals in the form of full-blown lilies. Their height, which is differently stated in Chronicles, was, according to 1 Kings vii. 23, twenty-three (18+5) cubits. It has long been a matter of dispute whether these pillars stood independently (so Bähr), or supported as columns the roof of the porch (so in LXX 1 Kings vii. 15, and among modern writers, Merz and others). The fact of their being reckoned among the vessels, and the house being complete without them, speaks against the latter view (6). The temple was surrounded on its three remaining sides by a *secondary erection of three tiers of side chambers*, צְלָעוֹת, designed for stores and treasures. The height of each story being five cubits, and therefore, if allowance must, as is probable, be made for projections, the height of the whole amounting at most to eighteen cubits, there would be sufficient space for the lattice windows mentioned 1 Kings vi. 4, which, moreover, were intended not for the purpose of lighting the edifice—for this was effected by lamps—but for ventilation. The holy of holies in the temple as well as the tabernacle was quite dark (comp. viii. 12). The temple was next surrounded by *two courts*, raised one above the other like terraces (comp. 2 Kings xxi. 5), of which, however, the inner alone was perhaps completed by Solomon, only one court being mentioned 1 Kings vi. 36. This is called, 2 Chron. iv. 9, חֲצַר הַכֹּהֲנִים, and Jer. xxxvi. 10, the upper court, from its elevated position. It was undoubtedly of a square form, like the court of the tabernacle, and of the temple in Ezekiel's vision (Ezek. xl. 47) (7). The second court, הָעֲזָרָה הַגְּדוֹלָה, the place of worship for the people, was probably separated from the first not by a wall but only by a railing, thus allowing the congregation to witness what was transacted in the court of the priests. Thus the separation of the people from the holy place was more strictly effected in the temple than in the tabernacle. The *furniture and vessels* of the temple corresponded on the whole with those of the tabernacle, except that they were of increased dimensions, and that some were found in the former which were absent from the latter. In the court of the priests, as in the court of the tabernacle, stood the altar of burnt-offering ; in the place of the laver of purification was the so-called brazen sea, whose rim was in the form of a full-blown lily, and which was supported by twelve brazen oxen, three turned to each quarter of the heavens ; on each side of the court were five brazen lavers, for the purification of all that pertained to the altar of burnt-offering ; upon the brazen bases of these lavers were carvings in raised work of lions, oxen, palms, and cherubim. In the הֵיכָל, as in the tabernacle,

were the altar of incense, the table of shew-bread (according to 2 Chron. iv. 8, *ten* tables of shew-bread); while instead of the one candlestick of the tabernacle there were ten golden candlesticks, five on each side, before the holy of holies. This was separated from the הֵיכָל by a thick wooden partition, in which were folding doors (1 Kings vi. 31). If a curtain was, according to 2 Chron. iii. 14, also added, it is uncertain whether this, as some suppose, covered the open doors, or as others, with Thenius, conjecture, hung over the doors. Besides this, entrance into the holy of holies was also prevented by chains of gold, for so must the difficult passage 1 Kings vi. 21 be explained, as by Ewald and others. In the *Holy of Holies* there were, besides the ark, two cherubim ten cubits high, whose four wings, each four cubits long, spread out horizontally, touched each other in the midst over the ark, and reached on the right and left to the two walls of the Holy of Holies.

(1) The literature concerning the temple of Solomon is very copious. Grüneisen's ample treatise, "Revision der jüngsten Forschungen über den salomonischen Tempel," in the *Kunstblatt* of the *Morgenblatt*. 1831, Nos. 73–80, formed a provisional close. Then followed monographs by Keil, *Der Tempel Salomo's*, 1839, comp. his *Archäologie*, i. p. 119 sqq.; Bähr, *Der Salomon. Tempel*, 1849; Thenius, *Das vorexilische Jerusalem und dessen Tempel*, an appendix to his Commentary on the Books of Kings, 1849; comp. also Ewald, *History of Israel*, iii. Merz's *Tempel zu Jerusalem*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xv. p. 500 sqq., forms another close, and contains a complete and critical review of the literature of this subject. I have entered so far only into the description as may be needful with respect to the symbolical significance of the sanctuary.

(2) Remains of Solomon's temple are still to be seen in the gigantic blocks of masonry, often thirty or more feet long, found among the foundations on the temple site.

(3) Merz, *id.* p. 503: Reckoning the cubit at 1 foot 5 inches, this gives 90 feet in length and 30 in breadth, about the dimensions of a moderate-sized village church, which indeed does not agree with the words, 2 Chron. ii. 45, "and the house which I built is great, for great is our God above all gods." Heathen temples, however, were generally small, being rather receptacles for the images of the gods than places of assembly for the people.

(4) דְּבִיר probably means the hinder space, not the place of speech, λαλητήριον, *oraculi sedes*, the word being lexically connected not with דָּבַר, but with the Kal דָּבַר, to be behind any one.

(5) Bähr, on the contrary, supposes a clerical error in 1 Kings vi. 2, and thinks that the whole building was but twenty cubits high.

(6) Merz appeals chiefly to Amos ix. 1. This passage would unquestionably favor the columnar character of the *pillars;* but it is not the temple at Jerusalem which is here spoken of.

(7) The notion that it was semicircular, rests upon the utterly unauthorized comparison of Solomon's temple with the temple of Urania at Paphos.

§ 168.

Significance and Dedication of the Temple.

The symbolical significance of the temple is entirely identical with that of the tabernacle. The Book of Chronicles (1 Chron. xxviii. 19), by referring to the inspiration of Jehovah the plan delivered to Solomon by David, perceives in this edifice *the impress of Jehovistic ideas.* It by no means follows from the circumstance

that Phœnician artisans were employed on the building, that the temple of Solomon coincided with *Phœnician* temples. Besides, Hiram, the only Phœnician foreman mentioned, was only employed in the preparation of the pillars of the porch and the vessels, 1 Kings vii. 13 sqq., and he had but to carry out the instructions given him (2 Chron. ii. 13, אֲשֶׁר יְנַתֶּן־לוֹ) (1). The two pillars of the porch have in the first place been incorrectly regarded as a heathen symbol. The name יָכִין signifies "he who establishes;" and בֹּעַז, probably = בּוֹ עֹז, "in him is strength," is by others derived from the Arabic *baghaza*, *alacritas* (2). The meaning of the pillars evidently is, that God has here established His temple on a firm foundation (comp. Ps. lxxxvii. 1), and that it is therefore to be no longer a travelling sanctuary like the tabernacle (comp. with respect to the contrast between the latter and the temple, 2 Sam. vii. 5–7). It is just because Jehovah no longer dwells in a moving tent, but in a settled house, that the cherubim *stand* in the temple upon the floor of the Holy of Holies, and make the whole place the constant abode of the Divine presence (as Hofmann justly remarks in his *Schriftbeweis*). It is a matter of no consequence that a pillar was also a symbol of Saturn, as the sustainer of the system of nature (3). If Bruno Bauer regards the pillars as symbols of the penetrating power of the solar beam, it must be remarked, on the other hand, that these pillars were not obelisks, whose needle-like form is emblematical of the rays of the sun (4). Secondly, the *twelve oxen* which supported the brazen sea might be regarded as originally a symbol of nature, namely, as symbolic of the months, the supporters of the order of ever-fleeting time. It is not, however, easy to see what a vessel for purification could have to do with such a symbol. The number twelve being always in worship the mark of the covenant people, the twelve tribes approaching Jehovah with animal sacrifices, by means of the Levitical priesthood, may, as Keil and others think, be rather intended. Palms, lilies, and pomegranates (comp. also § 119) are chosen as decorations, as the most beautiful of the natural productions of Palestine,—the palm being even in later days the symbol of the country on Jewish coins. The reason for increasing the one candlestick and table of shew-bread of the tabernacle to the *ten* candlesticks and ten tables of Solomon's temple, is found in the greater extent of the latter, the number ten being also itself a completed unity. But the clearest proof that Solomon's temple was not, as some extravagantly assert, a temple of the Sun or of Saturn, is to be found in the fact that, when Manasseh subsequently changed it into a sanctuary for the host of heaven, the existing symbols of worship were not made use of, but others introduced (2 Kings xxi. 5, 7, xxiii. 11). The temple being completed, Solomon had the *ark* brought into it, and the *tabernacle* taken down and deposited, together with its sacred utensils, in the temple, probably in the side chambers, 1 Kings viii. 4, thus putting an end to the twofold worship. The king then himself *dedicated* the temple by prayer and sacrifice in the seventh month (Tisri), 1 Kings viii. Then followed a festival of fourteen days' duration (vers. 2 and 65, comp. 2 Chron. v. 3, vii. 9 sq.), which must be understood as applying to the feast of the dedication from the 8th to the 14th Tisri, and to the seven days of the Feast of Tabernacles from the 15th to the 21st, the people being dismissed, according to 1 Kings viii. 66, on the 22d, but according to 2 Chron. vii. 10, not till the 23d, *i.e.* not till after the Azereth on the eighth day, comp. § 156.—A sanctuary of permanent countenance seemed now to be erected; and

Solomon expressed in his prayer the hope that this house might be a house of prayer for all nations (1 Kings viii. 41–43). He received, however, in a vision, an intimation from God, which, while it granted indeed the prayer that God would dwell in the temple, and renewed the promise given to David, threatened the destruction of the temple and the dispersion of Israel among all nations, in case they should go and serve other gods.

Concerning the *temple worship*, we further learn from ix. 25 that Solomon offered sacrifices three times a year, which refers probably to the pilgrimage feasts. Solomon having at the commencement of his reign deposed Abiathar as an adherent of Adonijah, the *high-priesthood* again devolved to the line of *Eleazar* (ii. 27), to which Zadok belonged.

(1) Though Vatke makes the temple of Heracles at Tyre the model of Solomon's temple, we learn, on the other hand, from K. O. Müller, *Archäol. der Kunst*, sec. 3, p. 298, that nothing at all is known of the construction of this temple; and when the temple of the Syrian goddess at Hierapolis, described by Lucian, *de Dea Syria*, cap. 28 sqq., and of which no one knows whether its architecture was of specifically Phœnician character, is dragged into the discussion, every one can see that the similarity said to exist between the two temples is as vague and indefinite as that between a hundred others.

(2) It is the notion of Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, iii. p. 238), that Solomon may perhaps have thus designed to perpetuate the names of two favorites, or perhaps of two of his younger sons.

(3) When Movers (*Phönicier*), however, thinks that the pillar Boaz signified motion proceeding forth from eternal repose,—creative motion,—somewhat too much is attributed to it; a pillar is said to symbolize motion—*lucus a non lucendo*.

(4) [Schultz (p. 384) regards them as symbols from the Asiatic Nature-religion; Vatke dreams of the phallus, the symbol of procreative strength.]

§ 169.

Hebrew Proverbial Poetry: The Hhakhamim (1).

As the sacred lyric poetry of Israel is connected with the name of David, so Solomon, whose peaceful times invited the Israelitish mind to self-introspection, was the father of the Hebrew proverbial poetry, 1 Kings v. 12 sq., iv. 28 sq., and thus the founder of the Old Testament Hhokhma. From his time onward there appeared a special class of men under the name of חֲכָמִים, [Hhakhamim] "the wise" (Prov. i. 6, xxii. 17, xxiv. 23, etc.), who applied themselves to the consideration of the moral relations of life and the manner in which the world is ordered. It cannot, however, be inferred from 1 Kings iv. 33 that they were addicted to physical science, nor that Solomon commenced, as Ewald *e.g.* supposes, a complete natural history. For when it is there said that "Solomon spake of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he spake also of beasts, and of fowls, and of creeping things, and of fishes," it is that ethical contemplation of nature of which we have specimens in Ps. civ. and in the Book of Job, especially ch. xxxix.–xli.,—that relative knowledge which enabled Solomon in his proverbs to draw comparisons and parables from natural objects, which is intended, and which does not presuppose a scientific knowledge of botany and zoology (as even Keil *in loc.* thinks). The Hhakhamim (or the wise) were at any rate distinct from

those theocratic officials, the prophets and priests (comp. Jer. xviii. 18, though it is questionable whether חָכָם is to be there taken in its narrower meaning; see, on the contrary, viii. 9 sq.). *The province of the Old Testament Hhokhma* was different from that of the Law and of Prophecy,—it did not extend to theocratic enactments and directions (2). There is not, however, the slightest trace that the Hhȧkhamim (as Bruch especially represents the matter in his *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, 1831) set themselves in opposition to theocratic enactments, particularly those relating to worship, and occupied the position philosophers do with respect to orthodox theologians. Such a notion is at variance with the fact that Solomon, who built the temple and gave completeness to the ritual of worship, stands at the head of these men; and that among those wise men mentioned 1 Kings iv. 31, besides himself, viz. Ethan, Heman, Chalcol, and Darda, the two first named were probably the well-known Levitical chief singers (1 Chron. xv. 17) (3). A circle of sages, among whom the king was distinguished for the fertility and many-sidedness of his genius, and for his acuteness in solving enigmatical questions (comp. besides 1 Kings iii. 13 sq., x. 1), was probably formed at Solomon's court. An association of Hhakhamim, employing themselves in the collection of literature, must, according to Prov. xxv. 1, have also existed under Hezekiah (5). This does not, however, prove that these sages had any official vocation in the nation, and founded institutions like the schools of the prophets; nor that, as Ewald expresses it, they were constantly forming more perfect schools (4). Disciples, eager for knowledge, may certainly have united themselves to individuals in special repute for wisdom (comp. such passages as xiii. 20, xv. 12, etc., in connection with i. 6, etc., already quoted); but the Wisdom which speaks in the Proverbs does not desire to be the mere wisdom of the schools, but "crieth without and uttereth her voice in the streets," i. 20. The places in which the wise dispensed counsel, administered reproof, exhortation, or instruction, as circumstances required, discussed the problems which were agitating the minds of men (comp. *e.g.* Ezek. xviii. 2 sq.), excited and delighted their hearers by witty sarcasm, etc., were the public places where justice was administered and the affairs of the community debated,—where even prophets, as occasion demanded, also delivered their testimony to the people. The description given by Job of himself, ch. xxix. 7–11 and 21–25, may be mentioned in illustration (6).

(1) [Comp. the art. "Pädagokik des A. T." in Schmid's *Pädagog. Encyklopädie*, 1st ed., vol. v. p. 677 sqq.]

(2) Its drift, as Delitzsch states it in his excellent article "Sprüche Salomo's" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xiv. p. 715, is towards what is human or universal in Israel, what in the worship of Jehovah pertains to man as man, and what in the Law is of common obligation.

(3) So Hengstenberg and Keil; Thenius and Delitzsch dispute, but upon insufficient grounds, the identity of the names. For the refutation of the opposite view see Hengstenberg on Ps. 88.

(4) It cannot be determined whether these "men of Hezekiah" constituted a special commission whose object was the restoration of the ancient national literature (appendix to Drechsler, *Der Prophet Jesaja*, ii. 2, p. 221), or formed a voluntary association.

(5) In the treatise "Ueber die Volks- und Geistesfreiheit Israels," *Bibl. Jahrb.* i. p. 97, which contains many other just observations.

(6) It was thus that Wisdom became that intellectual power in the nation, so well described by Ewald in the treatise quoted (art. *Pädagokik des A. T.*). For further particulars, see the third part of the Old Testament theology.

§ 170.

Solomon's External Organizations. The Dark Sides of his Reign. Division of the Kingdom.

Solomon employed the long interval of peace in still further carrying out the organization of the state, in rearing various *edifices* and fortifications, especially in Jerusalem itself (1 Kings ix. 15 sqq., xi. 27), and in the promotion of industry and *commerce*, which latter extended from the Edomite ports of Elath and Ezion-geber, now belonging to Israel, as far as to Ophir, *i.e.* probably the lands of the Indus (1 Kings ix. 26 sqq., x. 11, 22) (1). This "magnificent reign" (Hasse) had, however, its *dark side*. The king's love of splendor became more and more oppressive to the people, and he sank deeper and deeper into effeminacy and luxury, till he at last allowed himself to be seduced by his heathen wives into an open breach with theocratic institutions, by erecting for their sakes (xi. 4 sqq.) sanctuaries for strange gods in the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem, ver. 7, comp. with 2 Kings xxiii. 13. His intention apparently was to obtain for Israel a higher position among the nations of the world, by attempting *to break through the exclusiveness of the people;* in a political point of view, by opening the country to the commerce of the Phœnicians, in a religious one, by striving after general religious freedom. Nor were the people themselves free from religious and moral libertinism, for from this time forward we meet with a class of men forming a contrast to the Hhakhamim,—lascivious free-thinkers, called לֵצִים, *scorners*, in the Book of Proverbs. Their definition is thus given, Prov. xxi. 24, where a proud and insolent one who acts with excess of audacity is called לֵץ (2). The *prophetic order*, however, which had, it seems, long remained in the background, now arose against the king, to avenge the insulted majesty of the law. After a warning (1 Kings xi. 11–13) had been given to Solomon,—perhaps by Ahijah the Ephraimite,—*Jeroboam*, a high official of Solomon, received an intimation from the prophet Ahijah that ten tribes of Israel were to be severed from the house of David and to be united in a separate kingdom under the sceptre of Jeroboam, ver. 29 sqq. (3). The procedure of Ahijah on this occasion corresponds with that adopted by Samuel toward Saul, and is equally incapable of being explained from self-seeking motives, as is attempted *e.g.* by Ewald (*History of Israel*, iv. p. 287), who thinks that the prophetic order was again seeking to exercise supremacy over the kingship, because it failed to perceive that the period of prophetic power was past (as though the political agency of the prophets would not be now legitimately exercised !) It cannot even be correctly asserted that Ahijah incited Jeroboam to rebellion. With respect to Solomon, Ahijah expressly declared, ver. 34, that Jehovah would let him be ruler of Israel all the days of his life ; and Jeroboam might learn how he was to behave from David, who, humanly speaking, had far more reason for rebelling against Saul, but who waited for that Divine leading which assured to him the issue promised without arbitrary interference on his part (see Keil *in loc.*). Jeroboam, however, seems, even

during the life of Solomon, to have stirred up the people against their king. He was obliged to flee to Egypt; but being recalled immediately after the death of Solomon, he placed himself, at the popular assembly convened at Shechem, at the head of those who petitioned Rehoboam on the part of the people. When their reasonable demands were perversely rejected by Rehoboam, ten tribes renounced their allegiance, and made Jeroboam their king. In vain did Rehoboam raise a considerable force from that part of the nation which remained faithful to him; a word from the prophet Shemaiah sufficed to disband his whole army (xii. 22 sqq.; 2 Chron. xi. 2 sqq.) (4). The ancient jealousy of the two powerful tribes of Ephraim and Judah, and the opposition of Judah to the rest of Israel, which had already resulted in a temporary division of the kingdom after Saul's death (§ 165), and again in the latter days of David, on the occasion related 2 Sam. xix. 41–43, xx. 1 sq., now resulted in the permanent *separation of Israel into two kingdoms*. The question, *how the ten tribes which composed the northern kingdom are to be reckoned*, is so difficult to answer, that many have endeavored, with Keil, to regard the number ten as merely symbolical; which view the expression "we have ten parts in the king," 2 Sam. xix. 43, may perhaps be considered to corroborate. The tribe of Levi not being reckoned (as already remarked, § 92) in the political division of the nation, and Benjamin belonging, according to 1 Kings xii. 21, 2 Chron. xi. 3, x. 23, xiv. 7, to the kingdom of Judah, it would seem that the number ten must refer to the remaining tribes, Manasseh and Ephraim making two. But the tribe of Simeon cannot possibly be set down to the northern kingdom, although 2 Chron. xv. 9 (xxxiv. 6) assumes that Simeonites belonged to it. The lot of this tribe lay, according to Josh. xix. 1–9, within the realm of Judah, in the south-west, toward Philistia and Idumea. It seems not to have formed a compact province, but to have consisted of several single towns and districts. The Simeonite town Beer-sheba is, in 1 Kings xix. 3, expressly said to have belonged to Judah. On the other hand, Bethel, Gilgal, and Jericho, chief places in the tribe of *Benjamin*, appear as towns of the northern kingdom; and the Benjamite town of Ramah, only nine miles north of Jerusalem, belonged, at least under Baasha, to the same, according to xv. 17, 21. The tribe of Benjamin, too, in virtue of ancient kinship, had always adhered to the house of Joseph, and during the march through the wilderness had been combined into a triad with Ephraim and Manasseh, Num. ii. 17 sqq., x. 21–24 (comp. § 29 and note 5). In the former disruption of the kingdom, it had, as the tribe to which Saul belonged, been on the side of the tribes that separated from David; nay, even subsequently, we find, from 2 Sam. xx. 1, a rebellion arising in Benjamin at the instigation of Sheba. So too, in Ps. lxxx., which refers to the carrying into captivity of the northern kingdom, we find Benjamin placed, ver. 3, between Ephraim and Manasseh. The actual state of things was that the tribe of *Benjamin was divided between the two kingdoms*. The greater part of the country belonged to the northern kingdom, while the certainly more populous part, in which the northern part of Jerusalem and its neighborhood were situated, was united to the kingdom of Judah. Thus it was true both that the house of David, strictly speaking, possessed but one (entire) tribe, as it is expressed 1 Kings xi. 13, 32, 36, and that numerous members of the tribe of Benjamin belonged to Judah (5). That portion, too, of the tribe of Dan which dwelt in

their original lot, Josh. xix. 40 sqq., between Benjamin, Judah, and Ephraim, belonged to Judah. A few Danite cities are mentioned, 2 Chron. xi. 10, xxviii. 18, as pertaining to the kingdom of Judah; but since this tribe dwelt partly in the north, it may nevertheless be reckoned among the ten. Thus Rehoboam's army may correctly be spoken of, 1 Kings xii. 23, as "all the house of Judah and Benjamin, and the rest of the people." Among the children of Israel who dwelt in the cities of Judah, mentioned ver. 17 as Rehoboam's subjects, were probably included members of other tribes also. And when to these are added the numerous emigrations from the northern kingdom into that of Judah in succeeding centuries (comp. 2 Chron. xv. 9), it may well be said that among the *Jews* (יְהוּדִים), which name now arose in the southern kingdom, *all Israel* was represented. The disruption of Israel was from this time irremediable; in a short time, not reckoning the reigns of Ahab and Jehoshaphat and their immediate successors, the separated kingdoms took hostile positions with respect to each other (6), and at last consumed their strength in sanguinary wars. The external glory of the kingdom was at an end; but prophecy never ceased to direct the expectation of the nation to the future reunion of the twelve tribes under one head of the house of David (comp. § 176, conclusion, § 224, 2).

(1) Ritter, in his *Erdkunde*, xiv. pp. 348–431, gives a detailed investigation of Solomon's trade to Ophir.

(2) See on this subject Ewald, *id.* iii. p. 72; Delitzsch, *id.* p. 713.

(3) The lasting stability of his house, *i.e.* of his family, was also promised to Jeroboam if he should continue faithful to the Divine law. This promise was accompanied, however, by a declaration, 1 Kings xi. 39, that the humiliation of David's house was but temporary. It was thus shown that the promise of perpetual kingship was to be realized in the dynasty not of Jeroboam but of David (see Keil *in loc.*).

(4) This circumstance shows the respect in which the prophetic office was still held by the people, although its public agency had for a long period been intermitted.

(5) Comp. Hengstenberg in his commentary on Ps. lxxx. Hupfeld's interpretation of the last quoted passage is very unnatural, when, treating of Ps. lxxx., he understands by the *one* tribe Benjamin, which David's house was to retain *besides* Judah. There is no authority for making up the number of the ten tribes (as Delitzsch does in his *Commentary on the Psalms*), by counting the tribe of Manasseh as two.

(6) That the two kingdoms subsequently, perhaps under Uzziah, were on more friendly terms, and even concluded a "league of brotherhood," is a notion invented in explanation of Zech. ix. 13, xi. 14 (see *e.g.* Bleek in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1852, pp. 268 and 292), and without foundation in the historical narratives.

THIRD DIVISION.

THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES.

§ 171.

Preliminary Remarks.

The history of the Northern kingdom, called, as the basis of the nation, the kingdom of *Israel*, or, after its chief tribe, that of *Ephraim*, comes chiefly under the consideration of biblical theology, as exhibiting, in the conflict waged against the apostate realm by the *prophetic order*, the powerful agency of the latter, and as manifesting, in the whole course of the events which befell it, the serious nature of *Divine retribution*. Nine dynasties, including nineteen kings (not reckoning Tibni, 1 Kings xvi. 22), succeeded each other in the two centuries and a half during which the kingdom existed (from 975 to 720 B.C.), and only two, those of Omri and Jehu, possessed the throne for any length of time. The history is full of conspiracies, regicides, and civil wars; it is a continuous testimony to the fact that, when once the divinely appointed path is forsaken, sin is ever producing fresh sin, and that the punishment of one crime is inflicted by another.

The history may be best divided into *two periods*. The extirpation of Omri's dynasty by Jehu, after his elevation to the throne by Elisha, forms the *chief turning-point*. Under Jehu's dynasty, the kingdom, which was hastening to its destruction, entered upon a new career of prosperity, but only to succumb the more speedily to its final doom.

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM JEROBOAM I. TO THE OVERTHROW OF THE DYNASTY OF OMRI (ACCORDING TO THE USUAL CHRONOLOGY 975–884 B.C.)

§ 172.

Jeroboam I. to Omri.

Jeroboam at first took up his abode at *Shechem*, the ancient capital of Ephraim. Subsequently, however, he dwelt at *Tirzah*, xiv. 17, which continued to be the capital under his immediate successors, xv. 21. The first measure taken by Jeroboam was *to make the political separation of the tribes a religious schism*, by completing the breach with the theocratic institutions, the connection of his people with the worship at Jerusalem seeming to him politically dangerous. In his innovations, however, Jeroboam followed tradition. He erected *two separate sanctuaries*, one in the south at *Bethel*, a place consecrated by ancient memories. This was the "king's chapel," as it is called Amos vii. 13, a designation which very characteristically expresses the fact, that in the kingdom of the ten tribes the politico-ecclesiastical had taken the place of the theocratic principle. The other sanctuary was erected in the north at *Dan*, where image-worship had already existed in the time of the Judges (Judg. xviii.). In causing Jehovah to be

worshipped at these places under the symbol of a *calf*, Jeroboam returned to the image-worship instituted by Aaron in the wilderness, as is shown by the words of 1 Kings xii. 28, which are borrowed from Ex. xxxii. 4. Since, however, the Holy One of Israel was thus degraded to a power of nature, this image-worship was nothing else than idolatry, and was treated as such by prophets (7). A similar worship must subsequently have existed in *Gilgal*, which is named along with Bethel, Amos iv. 4 (comp. also v. 5; Hos. iv. 15, ix. 15, xii. 12) (2). One main obstacle to the new worship was formed by the Levites dwelling among the ten tribes. Jeroboam therefore, as we learn from 2 Chron. xi. 13 sqq. (comp. xiii. 9), drove from his realm the *Levites and priests;* and these, together with other subjects of the northern kingdom who refused to take part in this apostasy from the legitimate worship, departed in great numbers to the kingdom of Judah. In their place, according to 1 Kings xii. 31 and xiii. 33, he "made priests out of the whole people (of the lowest of the people, A.V.) who were not of the sons of Levi; whosoever would, he consecrated him," etc., comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 9 (3). The moral disorder to which this priesthood of the northern kingdom fell a prey is shown Hos. iv. 6 sqq., vi. 9. Of the *religious ceremonies* introduced by Jeroboam, we are only told, 1 Kings xii. 32, that he instituted a feast corresponding to the Feast of Tabernacles, transferring it from the 15th of the seventh, to the 15th of the eighth month, (perhaps out of regard to the later harvest of the northern districts.) It is, however, evident, from several allusions in the prophets *Amos and Hosea*, that many Mosaic forms of worship were practised in the sanctuaries of the northern kingdom. For though the date of these prophets is more than a century later, it is certain that such forms of Jehovistic worship as existed in their days in the kingdom of the ten tribes could not have been introduced subsequently to Jeroboam, but must have been handed down from ancient times in this kingdom. From Hos. ii. 13, compared with ix. 5 (v. 7), Amos v. 21, viii. 5, 10, we see that the celebration of the Sabbaths, new moons, and festivals still continued; from iv. 5, v. 22, that the different kinds of Mosaic sacrifices were in use; from Hos. iv. 7 sqq., that the priests partook of the sin-offerings; while Amos iv. 4 contains allusion to the tithes of the third year (4).

Jeroboam had rid himself, as has been said, of the priests and Levites; but the opposition of the *prophets*, those watchmen of the theocracy, was only the more determined. Individual prophets, indeed, when they found that Jehovism continued to be the state religion, and that the newly introduced image-worship maintained several of the ancient legal forms, may have been satisfied, or, like the old prophet of whom we read 1 Kings xiii. 11 sqq. (5), have been silent from fear. But after the arrival of the prophet from Judah, who, according to ch. xiii., prophesied against the worship at Bethel, and warned Jeroboam in vain, *Ahijah*, the same prophet who had foretold his elevation, and who still dwelt at Shiloh, pronounced the curse of God against him, on account of this very image-worship, and predicted the extirpation of his house, as near at hand, 1 Kings xiv. 7 sqq.

Nadab the son of Jeroboam was slain, after a reign of two years, by *Baasha;* but as (according to the henceforth constantly recurring expression), he walked in the ways of Jeroboam, his son *Elah*, in accordance with the curse pronounced against his house by the prophet *Jehu*, xvi. 1 sqq., fell a victim to a conspiracy set on foot by *Zimri;* and this was, as we are expressly told ver. 7, designed also

as a punishment for the slaughter of the house of Jeroboam by Baasha. For it is the doctrine of prophetism, that even a deed accomplished in conformity with the Divine counsel, if not performed for the sake of God and with full submission to His will, falls back upon its author, and is condemned in him. Zimri, the assassin of Elah, having, after a reign of seven days, perished in the flames of his palace, a division of the kingdom seemed imminent, one part of the people adhering to *Tibni*, the other to *Omri*. The latter, however, succeeded in getting the upper hand, and the dynasty raised to the throne in him (929 B.C.) possessed it for more than forty years.

(1) [Comp. Kautzsch, art. "Jeroboam I." in Herzog, 2d. ed. vi. p. 534 sqq. and Baudissen, "Kalb, goldenes," *ib.* vii. 395 sqq.; Reuss, § 186; Duhm, p. 44 sqq. That Jeroboam in setting up the golden calf introduced nothing that was absolutely new in Israel is admitted. Most recent writers agree also that in this he adopted not an Egyptian but an old Semitic form of worship. But it is a different question, whether the calf worship can be properly represented as a worship which was *legal* from the time of Moses, as Schultz is inclined to think (comp. e.g. p. 316 sq. and 143), and which Duhm decidedly favors. They both lean to the theory that the temple gave offence by the contrast between the new house of God with its foreign splendor, and the old simplicity of worship (Schultz, p. 384), and Duhm sees in the temple a leading cause of the division of the kingdom (p. 55), a view which Baudissen justly characterizes (in the art. cited, p. 399) as unhistorical. Duhm *makes* a history of the division of the kingdom, in presenting a view diametrically opposite to that of the Scriptures. That the building of the temple took place with the co-operation of Nathan, that there is no trace of opposition to it on the part of the prophets, that Micah (iv. 1, and Isaiah ii. 21) predicts the highest glory for the mountain of the house of Jehovah, does not hinder him from asserting that *people* and *prophets* "knew that here a Phœnician temple of the sun was erected, and the moral and religious consciousness of both declared that to the view of religion here presented, their God, Jahve, could never be reconciled (p. 52 sq). This is Duhm's idea of the people of Israel, in the face and eyes of the statement of the Old Testament. And yet he does not hesitate to make it the glory of this people, in view of passages like 1 K. xix. 14, "that they resented the introduction of Baal and Astarte (under Ahab) as an intolerable innovation" (p. 51). His own statement (p. 64) also refutes his view, which may be seen in its full extent in his remark (p. 63) that the prophet Hosea sees in the falling away of the Israelites from David a falling away from Jehovah, but he (Duhm) a holding fast to Jehovah.]

(2) In 2 Chron. xi. 15, the setting up of *Seïrim* (goats, A. V. devils) as well as calves as objects of worship, is ascribed to Jeroboam; and this must either be understood as a statement that this form of idolatry also existed at that time in the nation, or we have in this passage a rhetorical expression (so Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, i. p. 200 f.), signifying that this calf-worship was no better than Seïrim-worship. [Kleinert (art. "Jeroboam" in Riehm) explains this Egyptian worship from the Egyptian connections of Jeroboam, while Baudissen (*Studien*, i. p. 137 sq.) holds the account in Chronicles to be unhistorical, but on insufficient grounds.]

(3) 2 Chron. xiii. 9: "Whosoever cometh to consecrate himself with a young bullock and seven rams, the same may be a priest of them that are no gods." The passage refers to some enactment akin to that of the Mosaic law concerning the priesthood.

(4) In Amos iv. 5 the exclusion of leaven is alluded to, and thank-offerings, free-will offerings, and, v. 22, burnt-offerings and meat-offerings are mentioned. On iv. 4 see § 136, note 3. [On Hos. iv. 8 comp. § 137, note 1, and Steiner-Hitzig in his *Comment.*, where חַטָּאת is taken as meaning sin-offering, whence it follows "that Hosea was acquainted with sacrifice in the form of sin-offering, and that

therefore the latter does not owe its existence to the post-exilic legislation."] What is said in the text is of the greatest importance with respect to the criticism of the Mosaic legislation. Undoubtedly none of these institutions would have been imported from the kingdom of Judah, unless the consecration of a high antiquity had rested upon them. And how much further would not Jeroboam have gone in separating his people from the religious institutions of Jerusalem, if these had been of as recent origin as the opinion of many moderns would make them?

(5) See the explanation of this narrative in Hengstenberg's *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, i. p. 187 f. As little can it be doubted that the calf-worship also had subsequently its prophets. But when Eichhorn goes so far as to assert (*Allg. Bibl. für bibl. Lit.* iii. p. 195) that the prophets of Israel did not oppose the image-worship at Dan and Bethel, and Vatke (*Religion des A. T.* p. 421) thinks that it can by no means be proved that the prophets of Israel were zealous for Jehovah as Him who was worshipped in the temple at Jerusalem, they simply ignore the facts of history (comp. on this point Hengstenberg, *id.* I. p. 182 sqq.), also art. "Prophetenthum des A. T." in Herzog.

§ 173.

The Dynasty of Omri.

Under Omri, the royal residence was transferred from Tirzah to the *city of Samaria*, of which he was the builder, 1 Kings xvi. 24. This well-situated city, which shortly vied in prosperity with Jerusalem, continued—though Omri's immediate successor seems to have dwelt more in Jezreel—to be from this time the capital of the kingdom (see xviii. 46, xxi. 1; 2 Kings ix. 15), which was now also called after it, the "kingdom of Samaria." Omri's *policy* was evidently directed toward obtaining peace for his kingdom, by the cultivation of friendly relations, not only with the kingdom of Judah, but also with other neighboring states. Peace seems to have been concluded, by the sacrifice of certain Israelitish towns (see the supplementary remark, 1 Kings xx. 34), with Damascene Syria, which, under the dynasty of the Hadads, had become, as Israel had already experienced under Baasha, a formidable power. The marriage of Omri's son, the weak *Ahab*, with the Phœnician princess *Jezebel*, is to be attributed to the above-named political motive. By the latter, however, who was a woman of an energetic spirit, an alteration for the worse was introduced into the kingdom after Ahab had ascended the throne. Hitherto the worship of Jehovah, though in an idolatrous form, had still been the national religion; but now the *worship of Baal and Ashera* was, at the instigation of the queen, set up in its stead, a temple built for Baal in Samaria itself (xvi. 32 sq.), and (see especially xviii. 19) a vast number of the prophets of Baal and Ashera maintained among the people. Against the prophets of Jehovah, moreover, who must at that time have been numerous, a sanguinary persecution arose (vers. 4, 13), and they were put to death whenever the queen could lay hands on them. Under these circumstances the people remained passive: they halted between two opinions, as Elijah expressed it, ver. 21, *i.e.* they thought the worship of Jehovah and Baal compatible. At this period the conflict with triumphant heathenism was waged by the individual in whom was reflected the full glory of Old Testament prophetship, viz. *Elijah* the Tishbite, "the Prophet of Fire, whose word burnt like a torch" (as the son of Sirach describes him, xlviii. 1), and whose very name "Jehovah is my

God," testified against the apostate and irresolute race. Opposing singly the royal power (1 Kings xviii. 22), while other prophets were concealing themselves, but supported in this isolation by the certainty of being the instrument of the living God, he undertook to destroy with one stroke the bulwarks of idolatry, by slaughtering the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel, where the true God had borne testimony to His prophet (ver. 21 sqq.) The dejection, however, of the zealous prophet was put to shame, when, in a night-vision on Sinai, God, who drew near to him not in the storm, not in the earthquake, not in the fire, but in a still small voice, reminded him of the Divine patience, pointed him, while he thought himself the Lord's only worshipper, to the seven thousand hidden ones who had not bowed the knee to Baal, and at the same time revealed to him, by the command to anoint Hazael to be king over Syria, and Jehu to be king over Israel, the judgment which, though it tarries, at last surely overtakes offenders (ch. xix.). The appointment of Hazael to be king of Syria—a case in which the prophetic agency was exerted in foreign politics—did not, however, take place till later; and Jehu's elevation was effected by *Elisha*, who was appointed by the Divine command to succeed Elijah (1). After the vigorous measures of Elijah, the prophets again made their appearance in considerable numbers, and must (see 1 Kings xx. 13, 28) have been suffered to dwell unmolested in Samaria. They openly held communication with the king, in whose case the occurrence on Carmel had evidently not been without effect, and who received fresh proofs of the power of the true God in the victories granted him over the Syrians in accordance with the prophetic word, and afterward stern rebukes for his foolish and vacillating conduct to the conquered Benhadad (ch. xx.). Already, however, a multitude of *false prophets* had arisen, who spoke only such things as the king would like to hear; comp. the narrative in ch. xxii., where the single testimony to truth of Michaiah, the son of Imlah, is opposed to the false predictions of four hundred prophets (2). After the death of Ahab, who perished, according to the word of Michaiah (comp. § 200), in an unsuccessful battle against the Syrians, his son *Ahaziah* ascended the throne, walking during his short reign in the ways of his mother Jezebel, from which his brother and successor Jehoram somewhat deviated.

(1) The many *miracles* which appear in the history of Elijah and his successor Elisha are peculiar, no miracles being ordinarily attributed to the prophets of the Old Testament. Here, too, as well as at the exodus from Egypt, it appears that (as pointed out, § 63) the agency of miracles was chiefly employed when the point at issue was to prove the existence of the living God, as against the worshippers of the false gods. [Comp. also on this point the remarks in Orelli's art. "Elia" in Herzog, 2d ed. iv. p. 169.]

(2) That these 400 were not the prophets of Ashera (A. V. of the groves) of 1 Kings xviii. 19, whom Elijah did not cause to be slain, nor heathen prophets at all, is evident from xxii. 7, 24. They were more probably connected with the image-worship at Bethel.

§ 174.

Schools of the Prophets, and Characteristics of the Prophetism of the Period. Fall of Jehoram. The Rechabites.

The *schools of the prophets* are now again mentioned (1), though their historical connection with the association of prophets in the time of Samuel cannot be proved. It is probable that they were revived by Elijah, for the purpose of providing a kind of religious fulcrum for the people who were cut off from the lawful sanctuary and worship at Jerusalem, and of raising up men who would labor for the quickening of their spiritual life. Not less than three of these institutions are found within a tolerably limited area, and at the very head-quarters of idolatry, viz. at *Bethel* (2 Kings ii. 3), *Jericho* (ver. 5), and *Gilgal* (iv. 38), —the latter being afterwards, for want of room, transferred to the *Jordan valley* (vi. 1 sq.). From the last-named passage, as well as from ii. 7, 16 sq.,—in each of which fifty sons of the prophets are mentioned,—and iv. 43, a numerous attendance at these institutions may be inferred. About one hundred sons of the prophets sat before Elisha at Gilgal, and their number at Jericho could hardly have been less. The name בְּנֵי נְבִיאִים, *sons* of the prophets, which is not used of the association of prophets under Samuel, but first appears 1 Kings xx. 35, points to an *educational relation* (2). Eichhorn's explanation, which makes them sons properly speaking of prophets, is erroneous, for it is obvious that the prophetic office was not hereditary (3). There were, as is proved especially by the expression נַעַר, 2 Kings ix. 4, younger people among them ; but besides these, as the narrative iv. 1 shows, married men, who probably (see the expositors on the passage) had their separate households ; while the others, on the contrary, took their meals in common, iv. 38 sqq. From these communities the prophets seem to have traversed the country, for the purpose of exercising their ministry among the people. The example, however, of Elisha, who, according to ii. 25, iv. 25, must have dwelt—perhaps like a hermit in a cave—for a long time upon Carmel, and subsequently, according to v. 9, vi. 32, lived in his own house in Samaria, shows that they might also permanently take up their abode away from these institutions. From what has already been said, it is also evident that membership in these schools of the prophets imposed no obligation to celibacy. For the rest, their mode of life would certainly correspond with the gravity of their vocation. Even their external appearance was to announce their opposition to worldly conformity. For while Samuel, according to 1 Sam. xv. 27, wore the מְעִיל, which brought to mind the official robes of the high priest, Elisha wore, according to 2 Kings i. 7 sq., a rough mantle of sheep's or goat's skin or camel's hair, and a simple, unornamented leathern girdle. Henceforth the *hairy mantle* seems to have been a mark of the prophetic vocation (comp. Isa. xx. 2, according to which Isaiah wore sackcloth like a mourner, Zech. xiii. 4, Heb. xi. 37, and what is said of the raiment of John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 4, xi. 8). Hence Elijah, when he called Elisha to be his successor, cast his mantle upon him (1 Kings xix. 19),— a symbolical action, analogous to the investiture of priests with their office, which is nowhere else mentioned. Ordinarily there seems to have been no special ceremony for consecrating prophets to their office. Anointing (with oil) is indeed

mentioned 1 Kings xix. 16, but seems to have been omitted even in the case of Elisha (4). The succession to the prophetic office was not connected with any legal ceremony, nor dependent on human appointment, but is said to have rested solely on the direct call and consecration of God, Amos vii. 15, Isa. vi., Jer. i., Ezek. i. Elisha was indeed called by Elijah, but this was in virtue of a Divine command; and when Elisha entreated his master that he might be endowed with a double portion of his spirit above the other disciples of the prophet,—in other words, that he might receive the first-born's share of the spiritual inheritance, for so must the passage 2 Kings ii. 9 be understood,—Elijah intimated that the fulfilment of this desire was not in his power, and only gave him a sign by which he might recognize that God had granted his petition (ver. 10) (5).

It is specially worthy of remark, that these schools of the prophets served the people of the northern kingdom as *a substitute for the legitimate sanctuary*. From 2 Kings iv. 23, it may be inferred that the pious betook themselves, on the new moons and Sabbaths, to the schools of the prophets; nay, from the mention of the offering of first-fruits of barley loaves and new corn, ver. 42, it may be presumed that there were some who brought to the prophets the dues prescribed in the law (for the sanctuary). With regard to maintenance, the prophets seem in general to have been dependent upon voluntary contributions (6). Considering the great respect in which they were held by the people (comp. *e.g.* the narrative iv. 8 sqq.), though the worldly regarded them as mad, ix. 11, they could not easily have lacked support. For this reason, too, it would the more frequently happen that, after the persecution of the prophets had ceased, worthless babblers would assume the prophetic habit from covetousness, as we see to have been the case from the narrative 1 Kings xxii. Amos (vii. 12 sqq.) points to such a degenerate kind of prophetship, when, in reply to the scornful admonition of the priest in Bethel, to get fed for his prophecy in the land of Judah, he disclaims the honor of being taken for a prophet (*i.e.* one of the company of prophets) or the son of a prophet (*i.e.* a disciple of the prophets). In this passage, which is of the date of Jeroboam II., we meet for the last time with the expression בֶּן־נָבִיא, and consequently with the last trace of the schools of the prophets (7).—It was from a school of the prophets that the *overthrow of the dynasty of Omri* proceeded. While king Jehoram lay sick at Jezreel, in consequence of a wound received in battle against the Syrians, *Elisha*, to whom Elijah had bequeathed the commission entrusted to him 1 Kings xix. 16, sent one of the sons of the prophets to anoint *Jehu*, a captain of the host in the besieging army before Ramoth-Gilead, king over Israel, and to charge him with the execution of the curse pronounced by Elijah on the house of Ahab (xxi. 21–29). Jezreel was immediately surprised by Jehu, with whom his comrades combined; Jehoram, his mother Jezebel, and the whole house of Ahab were slain; and the worship of Baal soon after extirpated at one blow, 2 Kings ix. sq., the prophethood thus triumphing over the apostate kingdom. In this work assistance was afforded to Jehu by Jehonadab the son of Rechab, 2 Kings x. 15, 23, who is also known, from Jer. xxxv. 6, as the founder of the *Rechabites*, a kind of nomadic ascetics, belonging, according to 1 Chron. ii. 55, to the Kenites, who from the time of Moses had enjoyed the rights of hospitality in Israel, and must, according to the context of the passage in Chronicles, have been incorporated into a מִשְׁפָּחָה of the tribe of Judah. According to the

statement of Jeremiah, the Rechabites were bound to sow no seed, to plant no vineyards, and to drink no wine. It is worthy of note that the same particulars are stated to have constituted the *νόμος* of the Nabatæans by Diodor. Sic. xix. 94. Diodorus declares the purpose of this prohibition to have been the maintenance of their independence. In the case of Jehonadab, however, who appears before us as zealous for the Lord, a religious motive must undoubtedly be assumed; he probably desired, by the commands which he imposed upon his descendants, to preserve their lives from the moral and religious corruption of town civilization. The prohibition of cultivating the vine, the use of whose produce was forbidden them, must probably be referred to the fact that this plant belongs to a state of civilization. The now current notion that the Rechabites were connected with Nazaritism may be correct, but there is no authority for regarding them as Nazarites properly speaking. It is worthy of remark that, according to the passage in Chronicles, families of Sopherim (writers or scribes) are said to have arisen among the race of Kenites, descended from an ancestor named Hamath, to which the Rechabites also belonged.

(1) The schools of the prophets are first expressly mentioned under Jehoram, while the name of "sons of the prophets," given to members of these schools, already appears in the history of Ahab (1 Kings xx. 35).

(2) The designation, disciples of wisdom, in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, is analogous.

(3) Only one, and that an older example, is found of a son succeeding his father in the prophetic office, viz. that of Jehu the son of Hanani (1 Kings xvi. 1). The fact that the sons of the prophets are here and there called prophets (xx. 38, 41; 2 Kings ix. 4), and that in 1 Kings xx. 35 sqq. a son of the prophets appears, in virtue of "the word of the Lord" to him, to have exercised independent prophetic authority, certainly shows that the distinction between prophets and sons of the prophets was a fluctuating one, but does not authorize us entirely to deny it.

(4) Isa. lxi. 1 proves nothing in favor of the anointing of prophets, the expression being used figuratively. Hence the traditionary tenet found in many works, that kings, priests, and prophets were anointed, is, so far as the last particular is concerned, incorrect.

(5) Accordingly, when Elisha proved himself the inheritor of the *spirit* of Elijah, he received the respectful homage of the sons of the prophets, 2 Kings ii. 15. Of the kind of instruction given in the schools of the prophets we are told nothing; the discipline would tend above all things to inculcate unreserved obedience to the Divine word (when it proved itself to be such), and unconditional surrender to the Divine call. How strict the obedience required of prophets was, is evident from 1 Kings xiii. 20 sqq., xx. 35 sqq., and the history of Jonah. Comp. also Jer. i. 7, xx. 7 sq.; Ezek. iii. 17 sqq.

(6) It is evident from 1 Kings xiv. 3 (comp. 1 Sam. ix. 8) that presents were offered to the prophets when their advice was sought; the narrative 2 Kings v. 20–27, and especially the words of Elisha, ver. 26, show, however, the unselfishness which his calling imposed upon the prophet, and how he was obliged to avoid all appearance of mercenary service. 1 Kings xiii. 16 sqq. also refers to this particular.

(7) The Second Book of Kings makes no mention of schools of the prophets after the accession of Jehu. Their cessation is probably connected with the turn taken by prophecy in the northern kingdom after the death of Elisha (see § 175). [König (i. p. 48) conjectures—it is not susceptible of proof—that "there was also after Amos a secondary reproducing prophethood, which worked upon the thoughts uttered by the primary prophethood, gave them currency in poetry and music, and kept them in the memory of the nation," and that from this body proceeded the later

(false) prophets, who appeared contemporaneously with the apostasy of Israel, "and fancied themselves to be able by some means or other to ascertain the will of Jehovah and to lead the nation in the most direct way to prosperity."]

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM JEHU TO THE OVERTHROW OF THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES (884–720 B.C.).

§ 175.

The Dynasty of Jehu.

Jehu's dynasty maintained itself on the throne for more than a century, a longer period than that of any other. Jehu's reformation stopped half-way. The worship of Baal was indeed extirpated, but the illegal worship at Dan and Bethel, and also the Ashera (grove, A. V.) at Samaria, were left unmolested (2 Kings xiii. 6). Hence Jehu's house was, according to the prophetic word, 2 Kings x. 30, to possess the throne to the fourth generation, but then to be in its turn condemned, and to have the blood-guiltiness of extirpating Omri's dynasty avenged upon it (see Hos. i. 4) (1). The state of the kingdom under Jehu, and still more under his son and successor Jehoahaz, was in a *political* aspect a very unfortunate one; for Hazael, who had been raised according to prophecy to the throne of Damascus as a Divine scourge to Israel, repeatedly and successfully invaded the land, treating with especial harshness the part of Palestine east of the Jordan (Amos i. 3), which became for some time subject to the kingdom of Damascus. During this period of distress, the opposition of the prophets was withdrawn; nay, when the kingdom was reduced to the last extremity, it was by the mouth of the prophets that Divine deliverance was once more announced, the dying Elisha first promising to the dejected Joash, the son and successor of Jehoahaz, victory over the Syrians (2 Kings xiii. 14 sqq.), and *Jonah* the son of Amittai subsequently predicting the restoration of the ancient boundaries of the kingdom (xiv. 25) (2). Joash was successful in his wars against Damascus and Judah; but the glory of the kingdom was still further enhanced under his valiant son Jeroboam II. (825–784), who not only restored the ancient limits of the kingdom, but even conquered a portion of Syria. External success, however, effected no internal change; on the contrary, its internal corruption continuing to increase, it was during the period in which, to human eyes, it was attaining a hitherto unparalleled prosperity, that the state, together with its royal house, was hastening toward those judgments which the prophets *Amos* and *Hosea* were raised up under Jeroboam II. to proclaim. First, it was the shepherd of Tekoa who came from Judah and testified to the tyrannical nobles of Samaria, revelling in proud security, and to the multitude trusting in their mistaken and hypocritical piety, the approach of the day of the Lord (Amos v. 10 sqq., vi. 1–6) (3). Afterward, probably toward the end of Jeroboam the Second's reign, Hosea appeared; and when the respite granted by the prophetic word, 2 Kings x. 30, to the house of Jehu had nearly expired, he announced first to the latter, and then to the kingdom of Samaria in general, that judgment was now at hand, and continued his testimony during the terrible times beginning with Jeroboam's death.

(1) I at least can but esteem this the correct explanation of, "I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu," Hos. i. 4. [Hitzig refers the expression only to the murder of Ahaziah of Judah and his brothers, and to the massacre related in 2 Kings x. 11].

(2) The same *Jonah* of whom we read in the well-known book bearing his name. This prophecy is no longer extant; and it is not a very happy supposition on the part of Hitzig, that Isa. xv. is the production of the prophet Jonah.

(3) There was no lack of religious zeal among the multitudes. Pilgrimages were made to Bethel, to Gilgal, nay, even to Beersheba in the south (Amos v. 5, comp. with viii. 14); sacrifices were offered, tithes paid, and public calls for free-will offerings made (iv. 4 sq.); and it was thought that the Divine protection might be boasted of (v. 14), and the Divine judgments, the approach of which the prophet announced, be scoffingly invoked (ver. 18), because religion was supposed to be in a flourishing condition.

§ 176.

From Zachariah to the carrying away of the Ten Tribes.

The struggle between the Eastern and Western world, the first object of which was the possession of Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, began in the eighth century B.C., with the conflict between Egypt and Assyria. Hence *Amos*, ch. i. sq., sees the Divine judgments rolling like a storm over all these countries, and settling with threatening violence upon the kingdom of Samaria. Assyria, though not expressly named by this prophet, vi. 14, is pointed out as the instrument of the Divine chastisement. After the death of Jeroboam, dreadful disorders broke out in Samaria; see the description relating thereto in Hos. iv. If the chronological statements concerning the reigns of the monarchs of both kingdoms have been correctly transmitted, an *interregnum* in Samaria of from ten to twelve years' duration must be admitted. A comparison of several passages in Hosea and the Books of Kings shows that a dissension had arisen between the eastern and western portions of the kingdom, and that pretenders to the crown from these different parts were contending with each other. *Zachariah* the son of Jeroboam fell a victim to a conspiracy six months after his accession, and thus was fulfilled the doom prophesied against his house. *Shallum*, the murderer of Zachariah, was himself slain, after a reign of one month, by *Menahem* (771 B.C.), 2 Kings xv. 13 sqq. The horrors of these days are depicted by Hosea, ch. vii. (1). Many refer Zech. xi. 8 to this period, because the short space of one month saw three kings; but in that case another pretender to the crown, not mentioned in the historical books, would have to be admitted (2).

A decided turn was now, however, given to affairs; for Menahem smoothed the way for *Pul*, king of Assyria, to enter the country, and thus laid the foundation of Israel's dependence on Assyria. Whether, as is the most natural view of 2 Kings xv. 19, he himself called in the assistance of that monarch for the purpose of establishing him on the throne amidst the strife of parties, or whether it was the opposite party that invoked his aid (3), Menahem purchased Pul's assistance, in confirming him in the kingdom, by heavy sacrifices. This was the *first stage of the threatened judgment* (4). Israel had now placed itself upon the theatre of universal history, but only that, instead of being chastised by lesser and neighboring nations, it might be visited by the oppressions of those universal monarchies

which were chosen to be the instruments of Divine judgments and then, when they had subserved the Divine purpose, were themselves to perish, according to that law of the Divine government described especially by Isaiah, ch. x. 5. In Samaria was henceforth developed that unhappy policy which, while on the one hand courting the Assyrians, was on the other secretly combining with Egypt for the purpose of throwing off, by her assistance, the Assyrian yoke. In opposition to such diplomatic intrigues, the *prophets* made it their business to inculcate a higher policy, by a consistent assertion of the theocratic principle, which was simply this, that Israel should never court the protection of a worldly power, but seek assistance from God alone, whom they must, however, also fear as the just avenger of apostasy, against whom no earthly help could defend them; while, on the other hand, if they had once entered into alliance with a heathen power, they were bound conscientiously to observe their engagements, and could under no condition expect a blessing from a breach of faith; comp. as chief passages, Hos. v. 13 sq., vii. 8–16, viii. 9 sq., x. 4, xii. 2. Such exhortations, however, found no audience; and the prophets were despised and persecuted as fools (according to the correct interpretation of Hos. ix. 7 sq.; see *e.g.* Umbreit on this passage). It was, however, no longer their office to save from ruin by deeds of deliverance, such as former prophets of the kingdom of the ten tribes had performed, since the extirpation of the "sinful kingdom," as it is called, Amos ix. 8, was irrevocably determined, and the judgment which was to be gradually accomplished was already in process. All that could now be effected by the prophetic word was to exhibit the misfortunes with which the kingdom was visited in the light of Divine judgments, to rescue by an urgent call to repentance all who would let themselves be rescued from the general ruin, and, finally, to enlighten the faithful remnant of the people concerning the final purpose of the Divine proceedings, by directing their attention to the redemption already dawning behind the dark cloud of rejection. With such testimony does *Isaiah* as well as *Hosea* accompany the history of the ten tribes till its fall.

The coming ruin was hastened by *Pekah*, who, after slaying *Pekahiah* the son of Menahem, ascended the throne B.C. 759. He allied himself with the Damascene kingdom, the hereditary enemy of Israel, against Judah, probably with the hope of strengthening himself, by the overthrow of Judah and the dethronement of the house of David, against the encroaching power of Assyria. The ancient hatred of Ephraim toward Judah, which had so frequently during the last two centuries led to sanguinary conflicts, was now once more to burst forth with fury, and to hasten the destruction of Ephraim. The Assyrian monarch *Tiglath-pileser*, whose assistance had been invoked by Ahaz, having first executed against Damascus the judgment predicted by Amos, ch. i. 3 sqq., took the provinces east of the Jordan and the northern portions of those west of this river (Galilee), and carried away the tribes inhabiting these regions into the interior of Asia, about 740 B.C. (2 Kings xv. 29). This was the *second stage of the judgment*. Isaiah (ix. 9) describes the people of Samaria, however, as receiving all such Divine corrections with arrogance and presumption, and comforting themselves with wicked hopes of better times (5). *Hoshea*, who obtained the throne by conspiring against and slaying Pekah, and who, according to 2 Kings xvii. 2, was comparatively a better king, became tributary to the Assyrian king *Shalmaneser*, but sought,

by concluding an alliance with *So*, king of Egypt (the Sabakon of Herodotus), to release himself from this dependence. Shalmaneser, who was then occupied in Hither Asia, immediately marched into the land of Israel. Hoshea, after being, as it seems, summoned to the Assyrian camp to account for his conduct, was imprisoned, and Samaria attacked. But an heroic resistance must have been made in this as in all the deadly struggles of the Israelites ; for it was not till after a three years' siege that it was taken, and "the proud crown of the drunkards of Ephraim trodden under foot," Isa. xxviii. 3 [not, as is now settled by the cuneiform inscriptions, by Shalmaneser, but by his successor, *Sargon* (6), mentioned in Isa. xx. 1]. The people were led into *captivity* 720 B.C. (comp. also § 177), and thus *was the judgment accomplished* (comp. the description of this catastrophe, 2 Kings xvii. 7–23). The dwelling-places assigned to the exiles were situated in Media and the upper provinces of Assyria (ver. 6). It has been already remarked (§ 170, note 7) (7) that the continued existence of the ten tribes during the subsequent centuries is attested by 1 Chron. v. 26, "unto this day," and Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 5, 2) ; their restoration is also expressly foretold by the prophets.

(1) Hos. vii. : "It is the king's feast, in which he carouses with the princes, who deride him in their hearts, for the flame of rebellion already glimmers again in secret. All night the baker sleeps ; in the morning it (the oven) glows like a flaming fire. They all glow like an oven, and devour their judges : all their kings fall ; none of them calls upon me," ver. 6 sq.

(2) It need hardly be remarked that קִבֵּל־עַם, 2 Kings xv. 10, cannot, as Ewald thinks, conceal a name. He smote him, it is said, "before the people."

(3) According to another view, Pul entered the country because Menahem adhered to the Egyptian party. The accounts are too brief to enable us to speak decidedly. [According to the cuneiform inscriptions the connections of Israel with Assyria were still earlier. According to them, Ahab in alliance with the king of Syria was defeated by Shalmaneser II. of Assyria at Karkar, and Jehu had purchased the protection of this monarch by gifts. Comp. Riehm, art. "Ahab" in his *Handwörterbuch ;* Kleinert, art. "Jehu" in the same work, and F. W. Schultz in Zöckler, i. p. 277.]

(4) It cannot be proved from 1 Chron. v. 26, which is appealed to in this matter, that, as some suppose, a deportation now took place.

(5) Isa. ix. 10 : "If the bricks have fallen, we will build with hewn stones ; if the mulberry trees are cut down, we will cause cedars to succeed them." Besides Hosea, who was undoubtedly a citizen of the northern kingdom, we meet in the Old Testament with another prophet who exercised his ministry at this time in Samaria, viz. *Oded*, who, according to 2 Chron. xxviii. 9–15, went to meet the army of Pekah as it was returning from Judah with a multitude of captives, and, after a serious expostulation, effected the deliverance and restoration of the prisoners. The prophet *Nahum* also probably belonged, at least by birth, to the northern kingdom.

(6) We certainly are not expressly told in 2 Kings xvii. 3, xviii. 9, that the king who conquered Samaria was Shalmaneser, but the context leads us to suppose it. ["The two apparently conflicting accounts, that of the Bible on the one hand and of the inscriptions on the other, are most easily reconciled by the assumption that the final and actual conqueror of the city was certainly Sargon ; but that this conquest appeared so much as the ultimate result of the three years' siege under Shalmaneser, that in the tradition of the Israelites who were proximately affected, not the final conqueror but rather the tenacious besieger, Shalmaneser, was regarded as having stormed the capitol." Schrader, art. "Salmanassar" in Riehm ; comp. also his art. "Sargon" in the same work.

(7) Compare especially the essay of Wichelhaus, "Das Exil der zehn Stämme Israels," *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1851, No. 4, p. 467 sqq.

§ 177.

Origin of the Samaritans (1).

In place of the Israelites who were carried into exile, colonies from central Asia were, according to 2 Kings xvii. 24, planted in the depopulated country [as is now established by the inscriptions, by Sargon. On the other hand, in Ezra iv. 2 the resettlement of Samaria appears as the work of Esar-haddon (the son of Sennacherib), but this is explained by the fact that this monarch also sent colonists into the still sparsely peopled land, as his own inscriptions testify] (2). These, to avert the judgments which befell them, mingled the worship of Jehovah, as the God of the land, with the heathen religions they had brought with them from their respective homes (2 Kings xvii. 25 sqq.). Thus arose the so-called *Samaritans* or Cuthites, כּוּתִים, as they were named by the Jews, from Cuthah, the native country of a portion of them (3). *Two views* are held with respect to these Samaritans. According to one, they were not a purely heathen people, but a mixed race arising from the intermarriage of the new colonists with the remnant of the ten tribes which was left in the land. The other and older view, that the Samaritans proceeded from wholly heathen races, has been re-advocated especially by Hengstenberg (*Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, i. p. 72 sqq. (4). It is certain that not much dependence can be placed upon the assertions of their Israelitish descent by the later Samaritans (see *e.g.* John iv. 12), since at one time they affirmed, at another time denied it, as their interests required (see the narratives in Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 8. 6 and xii. 5. 6) ; while neither, on the other hand, can Jewish accounts be trusted, the hatred of the Jews for the Samaritans furnishing them with a motive for denying all kindred with the latter. The Old Testament passages, 2 Kings xvii. 24 sqq., Ezra iv. 2, 9 sq., favor the second view. In the first of these, it is evident from ver. 27 that at all events the Israelitish priesthood had been entirely carried off ; in the latter, it is specially noteworthy that the Samaritans do not support their claim to a share in the new temple at Jerusalem by asserting their kinship to the Jews. On the other hand, it must certainly be admitted that, at least after the destruction of Samaria, a considerable Israelitish population must still have been found in the northern country. This is specially shown by 2 Chron. xxx. ; for the solemn Passover of Hezekiah there mentioned was in all probability held, not (as many suppose) in the beginning of his reign, but after his sixth year, and therefore after the destruction of Samaria (5). Of this population, however, it must also be admitted that it was carried away by Esar-haddon, who planted the colonists in the country. Nevertheless, even under Josiah, who, according to 2 Chron. xxxiv., destroyed the altars and images still existing in the northern regions, remnants of Manasseh, Ephraim, and of the rest of Israel are (ver. 9) assumed, and the men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria, named in Jer. xli. 5 as mourning for the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, were undoubtedly Israelites. Besides, the total deportation of the entire population of so important a district is hardly to be supposed possible. Thus much however, is certain, that the Israelitish element among the Samaritans, even reckoning the subsequent accession of Jews to their numbers (of which we shall speak in the

5th Division, § 192), must by no means be computed as so considerable as is generally the case (6).

(1) Comp. Kautzsch, art. "Samaritaner" in Riehm.
(2) Comp. Schrader, art. "Asarhaddon" and "Sargon" in Riehm.
(3) It cannot be determined with certainty whether Cuthah was, as Josephus says, a province in Persia, or, as others say, a town in Babylonia.
(4) Against Hengstenberg, see Kalkar, "Die Samaritaner ein Mischvolk," in Pelt's *Theol. Mitarbeiten*, 1840, iii. p. 24 sqq.
(5) [Not so Delitzsch, art. "Hiskia" in Herzog, who places this festival in the early part of the reign of Hezekiah.]
(6) [On the other hand, Kautzsch assumes that the Israelitish element among the Samaritans was much stronger than might appear from 2 K. xvii. 24 sqq., since only thus can the existence of a population so similar to the Israelites be explained.] The small remnant of Samaritans still found in Nabulus exhibit, according to the assertion of travellers, absolutely no approach to the Jewish physiognomy; compare Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. p. 647 sqq.

FOURTH DIVISION.

THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH.

§ 178.

Preliminary Remarks and Survey.

The history of the kingdom of Judah has a character essentially different from that of the kingdom of Israel. Though much smaller, especially after Idumea, the only one of the mountainous districts which at the disruption fell to the share of Judah, had gained its independence, it was still superior to the kingdom of Israel in *internal strength*. This resulted partly from its possession of the genuine sanctuary with its legitimate worship, its influential priesthood, and Levitical orders; and partly from its royal house, which, unlike most of the dynasties of the neighboring kingdom, had not been raised to the throne by revolution, but possessed the sanction of legitimacy and a settled succession (1), and was especially consecrated by the memory of its illustrious ancestor David, and the Divine promises vouchsafed to his race. Moreover, among the nineteen monarchs (of course not counting Athaliah) who occupied the throne 387 years, from Rehoboam till the fall of the state, there were at least some individuals distinguished for high administrative talents, in whom the ideal of the theocratic kingship was revived, such as Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah. Thus the kingdom gained a moral strength that prevented the wild spirit of insurrection and discord, by which the other kingdom was disturbed, from attaining anything like the same proportions. The opposition, indeed, between the natural inclinations of the people and the moral strictness of Jehovism could not but lead to conflicts here also; nay, the contrast between the two was all the sharper, because a syncretistic intermingling of heathenism and Jehovism could not be so easily effected,—a circumstance which explains the fact, that when the former did get the upper hand in Judah, it appeared in a still grosser form than in the kingdom of Israel.

By reason, however, of the firm foundation which the continuance of the legitimate theocratic authorities afforded to Jehovism in the state, there was no need of bloody revolutions to reinstate the latter in its rights, but only of *reformations*, and these were effected not so much by the energetic efforts of the prophets as by the kings themselves. Besides, since the preservation of the theocratic ordinances did not devolve in Judah exclusively upon the prophets, their position was different from that which they occupied in the kingdom of the ten tribes. At times their agency was exercised in perfect harmony with that of the two other theocratic powers; and reformations of worship being repeatedly undertaken by the kings, they were able to limit themselves to the ministry of the word. In tracing the history of the prophetic order, a distinction has been sometimes made between the prophetism of *deed* and *word* (2),—a distinction less adapted to designate two different periods than to characterize the prophetship in Judah in contradistinction from the older prophetship of the kingdom of the ten tribes. The prophets, finding in Judah the basis afforded by existing theocratic institutions, were not under the necessity of establishing new props; and there is no sort of evidence that *schools of the prophets*, or associations such as existed in the kingdom of the ten tribes, were organized in Judah. The Rabbins, indeed (3), represent schools of the prophets as existing in Judah down to the Babylonian captivity; but this arises from a confessedly erroneous interpretation of 2 Kings xxii. 14, where, by the מִשְׁנֶה (*i.e.* the lower district of the town) in which the prophetess Huldah dwelt, they understand a place of instruction (Targ. אוּלְפָנָא בֵּית) in the neighborhood of the temple. In the historical notices of the kingdom of Judah we meet only with individual prophets, a succession of whom continues, with but inconsiderable gaps, down to the captivity, and it was only around eminent prophets like Isaiah (comp. viii. 16), and afterward Jeremiah, that small circles of disciples were gathered, in whom the word of God fell upon good ground, in the midst of a rebellious nation, and was transmitted to future generations (4).

With respect to the *course of events* in the kingdom of Judah, a cursory glance presents a tolerably uniform alternation of apostasy from Jehovah and return to Him. Certain kings suffer idolatry to spring up; this finds support in the high places existing in different parts of the country, and such apostasy is followed by punishment in the calamities which then overtake the nation. Then arises again a pious king, who exerts himself to keep the people faithful to the legitimate sanctuary, and vindicates the authority of the legal worship, till at length, after repeated reformations, the apostasy and corruption become so great, that judgment sets in without intermission. In fact, however, the conflict between the theocratic principle and the apostasy of the people passes through *several characteristically different stages*. *In the first period*, extending to *Ahaz*, heathenism, which was never wholly extirpated, and which attained under some kings a temporary supremacy, appears in the form of the ancient Canaanitish deification of nature; the prophets, who during these two centuries are somewhat in the background, exercise their ministry during this period, so far as we know their history, in harmony with the priesthood; and the political relations of the kingdom do not extend beyond the states bordering on Palestine, among which Egypt at first appears as especially the enemy of Judah. *In the second period*, Judah, on the occasion of the momentous combination of Syria and Ephraim (comp. § 176),

appears on the great stage of universal history, and is drawn into that conflict with the Assyrian monarchy in which, after experiencing terrible reverses and witnessing the destruction of the kindred nation, it was miraculously preserved by Divine interposition. The contest against the worship of nature, which, in consequence of the religious influences proceeding from central Asia, now appears in an altered form, continues; but to the political complications of the age is added the opposition of the prophets to the false policy of the nation, and prophecy, enlarging its horizon in these stirring times, rises to a full and clear perception of the world-wide importance of the kingdom of God in Israel. *The third period* commences with the reformation under Josiah, which, after idolatry had reached its climax under Manasseh and Amon, was apparently the most thorough. This reformation was not, however, capable of effecting the revival of the deeply fallen people, and produced only an external conformity to the rites of religion. Even in earlier times, the prophets had been constrained to testify against a dead self-righteousness and an empty adherence to ceremonies; but an utter stagnation of vital religion, in which the priests as well as the people now participated, appears to be the characteristic phenomenon of the period; while, after the death of Josiah, not only did idolatry revive, but a fresh field was opened for the political agency of the prophets, by the conflict between the decaying kingdom and the Chaldæan power. This period closes with the fall of the state, and the carrying of the people to Babylon. During the first period we meet with no great representative of the prophetship,—Joel, who moreover belongs to a period free from idolatry, being the earliest who can be considered such. The ministry of *Isaiah* forms the focus of the second period; the chief prophet of the third is *Jeremiah*.

(1) The succession to the throne seems to have been generally determined according to the rights of primogeniture (2 Chron. xxi. 3), although exceptions occur. It is said of Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 21 sq.), that, after the example of David, he bestowed the throne upon the son of his favorite wife; and Jehoahaz, although the younger son of Josiah, was raised to the throne by the will of the people (2 Kings xxiii. 30). It is to be presumed that a regency occurred during the minority of a king. The Rabbins appeal in support of this to Eccl. x. 16; and the position filled by Jehoiada the high priest with respect to Joash was also of this nature, 2 Kings xii. 3 (§ 180). The *queen mother* seems generally to have possessed much influence, for we find great respect shown to her. The king bows himself before her (1 Kings ii. 19),—the queen-consort, on the contrary, falling down before the king, i. 16,—and she is called גְּבִירָה, queen, *κατ. ἐξ.* 1 Kings xv. 13; 2 Kings x. 13; Jer. xiii. 18, xxix. 2. Hence, on the accession of a king, the name of his mother is mentioned, 1 Kings xiv. 21, xv. 2, etc.

(2) Comp. G. Baur, *Der Prophet Amos erklärt*, p. 27 sqq., etc.

(3) Comp. Alting, *Historia academiarum hebr.* p. 243.

(4) We meet with a confidential disciple in Baruch, the faithful companion of Jeremiah.

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM REHOBOAM TO AHAZ (975–741 B.C.).

§ 179.

Rehoboam to Jehoshaphat.

The history of Judah under the reign of its first two kings, Rehoboam and Abijam, or, as he is called in Chronicles, Abijah, offers little that is worthy of notice. External misfortunes were added to the internal declension occasioned by the spread of idolatry,—the Egyptian king Shishak (Sesonchis among Greek writers) penetrating as far as Jerusalem, which he took in spite of the girdle of fortresses erected by Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 25 sqq.) (1). The victory gained over Jeroboam by Abijah (narrated 2 Chron. xiii.) (2) afforded no adequate compensation, nor does the slight extension of the kingdom by the three districts taken from the northern kingdom seem to have been permanent. Then followed the *first* reformation under Asa (about 955 B.C.), to which the king was urged by the prophet Azariah the son of Oded, 2 Chron. xv. 1, after a victory over the Egypto-Ethiopian king Zerah (3),—a reformation which was not able wholly to extirpate idolatry, because it did not succeed in penetrating into all its lurking-places. At this time appeared also the prophet Hanani (2 Chron. xvi. 7 sqq.), who rebuked the king, because in his war with Baasha he allied himself with Damascus instead of depending on the Divine protection, but was imprisoned for his boldness. *Jehoshaphat* the son of Asa, one of the best rulers of the house of David, was still more zealous for the establishment of the theocratic ordinances (914–889). He organized the administration of justice, xix. 5–11, in which a distinction was now for the first time made between sacred and secular law (דְּבַר יְהוָה and דְּבַר הַמֶּלֶךְ) (4). To promote religious knowledge among the people, a commission, consisting of five high officials, two priests, and nine Levites, was sent about the country with the book of the law to instruct the people, xvii. 7–9. There was undeniably in this respect a deficiency, which needed to be supplied, in the theocratic ordinances, the dissemination of religious knowledge among the people being chiefly carried on by oral family tradition (comp. § 105). The measures of Jehoshaphat, however, as we may infer from the narrative, did not aim at any permanent institution; and there is no ground for the view, entertained by many, that we have in them the rudiments of the synagogue. Hence it is easy to understand that, as soon as a king set them a bad example, the mass of the people relapsed into the worship of nature, which is undoubtedly agreeable to the sensual inclinations of mankind. Under Jehoshaphat not only did the priesthood attain great influence, but the powerful prophets Jehu and Eliezer also exercised their office during his reign (5); the Levite Jahaziel also came forward, xx. 14, entirely in the manner of a prophet. The reign of Jehoshaphat was also externally prosperous. Special danger threatened the state from an attack of the Ammonites, Moabites, and other nations dwelling on the east. It was, however, frustrated by the discord and mutual destruction of the hostile troops. The Korahite Psalms xlvii. and xlviii. probably refer to this deliverance. The alliance, however, of Jehoshaphat with the northern kingdom was a fatal mistake.

(1) About this time the above-named (§ 170) prophet Shemaiah appeared, and exerted an active influence at Jerusalem (2 Chron. xii. 5 ff.).

(2) We find, with Ewald, an historical germ in 2 Chron. xiii., notwithstanding the exaggerated numbers.

(3) Azariah is also intended, 2 Chron. xv. 18, where a prophet Oded appears only through a textual error.

(4) In 2 Chron. xix. 8–11, Jehoshaphat is said to have set up a supreme court at Jerusalem. Its organization corresponds with the injunction, Deut. xvii. 8 sqq. It was composed of Levites, priests, and heads of tribes, over whom were placed, according to ver. 10, the High priest and a secular judge, and it was instituted to give judgment (הוֹרִיר) in all difficult cases which should be brought before it by the local courts. The president of this court was appointed according to the distinction between "matters of the Lord" and "matters of the king." It is not stated what cases belonged to the one and what to the other.

(5) Jehu the son of Hanani (2 Chron. xix. 2), already mentioned (§ 172) among the prophets who remonstrated in the northern kingdom, and Eliezer (xx. 37) both sternly condemned the alliance into which Jehoshaphat entered with the kings of Israel.

§ 180.

Jehoram to Jotham.

Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, one of the worst kings of Judah (1), was married to *Athaliah*, a daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. Under her influence, he became a zealous promoter of the Phœnician idolatry, 2 Chron. xxi. 11 sq., 2 Kings viii. 18, now openly practised in Jerusalem, where a temple of Baal was erected; see xi. 18. His reign was also unfortunate externally. Edom fought for and gained its independence (comp. Jo. iii. 19), and became from this time, by reason of its mortal hatred toward its kindred nation, a most dangerous neighbor (comp. Amos i. 11 sq.). The Philistines and Arabians made incursions into the country, and withdrew with considerable spoil (comp. Jo. iii. 4 ssq.). In consequence of this invasion, many Jews were carried off as slaves, Joel iii. 3, 6, Amos i. 6, and thus began about this time (between 890 and 880) the *captivity* of Israel (2). Jehoahaz or (as he is also called) Ahaziah, the son of Jehoram, after a reign of scarcely one year, was slain along with the whole house of Ahab, on the occasion of a visit which he was paying to his royal relatives in Israel (comp. § 174). The daughter of Jezebel, who was worthy of her mother, now ruled absolutely at Jerusalem. The males of David's race were at this time grievously diminished, Jehoram having (2 Chron. xxi. 2–4) slain his six brethren, and himself lost all his sons except the youngest at the incursion of the Arabians (xxi. 17, xxii. 1); see above. Finally, Athaliah utterly extirpated the male descendants of the royal race, with the exception of Joash, a young son of Ahaziah, who was saved from the fury of his grandmother by his aunt, the wife of the high priest Jehoiada. This child, the last scion of the house of David, was concealed six years in the temple; and it now became evident how powerful the *priesthood* had grown under Jehoshaphat, the deliverance of Judah being effected not by prophets but by priests. In a cautiously planned and speedily executed insurrection, Athaliah was slain and Joash raised to the throne, upon which a renewal of the theocratic covenant and the extirpation of the worship of Baal took place, 2 Kings xi., 2 Chron. xxiii. (873 B.C.) (3). The guardianship of the young king was undertaken by Jehoiada; and it is

to the period immediately following (about 870 B.C.) that the book of the prophet Joel must, on internal grounds, be attributed. It was a period during which the worship of Jehovah flourished, and the prophets were held in so high respect, that, on the occasion of a grievous visitation, priests and people united, at the word of a prophet, in holding a solemn fast in the temple (4). The aspect of affairs was, however, entirely changed during the second half of the reign of Joash, after the death of Jehoiada. Idolatry, through the influence of the nobles, again got the upper hand; the zealous expostulations of the prophets were unheeded; and one of them Zechariah the son of Jehoiada was stoned by the king's command (5). After a very unsuccessful war against the Syrians, Joash fell a victim to a conspiracy (838 B.C.). A similar fate was experienced by his son Amaziah, after a reign at first prosperous, especially in his war against the Edomites, but rendered during its further progress most unfortunate by his fatal contest against Jehoash, king of Samaria (§ 175). In the latter conflict, Jerusalem itself was again conquered and plundered, 2 Kings xiv. 8–14; 2 Chron. xxv. 17 sqq. (6). *Uzziah*, in the Second Book of Kings and once in Chronicles called *Azariah*, ascended the throne at a time of great disorder. But from this time the kingdom of Judah attained, during the sixty-eight years which comprise the reigns of Uzziah and his son Jotham, a degree of power such as it had not possessed since the disruption; while the sister kingdom enjoyed under Jeroboam II. but a short period of prosperity (§ 175). On the south, Edom was subdued, and the territory of Judah again extended to the Gulf of Akabah; in the west, the Philistines were compelled to submit; on the east, the Moabites and Ammonites became tributaries to Judah instead of the northern kingdom. A powerful military force was raised, the country defended by fortresses, the fortifications of Jerusalem itself were strengthened, and trade and agriculture flourished (7). Still, notwithstanding the general adherence of Uzziah and Jotham to the theocratic ordinances, 2 Kings xv. 3, 34, the *moral and religious condition of the people was not satisfactory*. Luxury, pride, and oppression of the poor increased together with power and riches, while heathen superstitions and other foreign customs were at the same time disseminated. See the characteristics of the times described, Isa. ii. 5–8, 16 sqq., v. 18–23. *Idolatry*, too, probably of the same kind as the image-worship at Bethel, was tolerated, if not at Jerusalem, in other parts of the land, —at Beer-sheba, Amos v. 5, viii. 14; and Lachish, Mic. i. 13 (according to the probable meaning of this passage). Hence *Isaiah*, in spite of the scoffers in high places (v. 19 sqq.), announced in the days of Jotham the coming of the day of the Lord upon all who were proud and lofty, that they might be brought low, ii. 12. The judgment already in process of infliction upon the northern kingdom was now to overtake Judah also (see especially vi. 9–13); but here, where all was not as yet corrupt, it was to be accomplished by slower degrees (8).

(1) Jehoram seems to have entered upon the government while his father was still living. At least the difficulties here presented by the chronological statements are most easily obviated by admitting his association with his father in the government. See Schlier, *Die Könige in Israel*, p. 121 sq. and 124, who, however, reads too much in 2 Chron. xxi. 4 when he even makes Jehoram take his royal father into custody.

(2) The Jews dispersed in the heathen world are, as is well known, called

גּוֹלָה (Ezek. i. 1, iii. 11, etc.; LXX *αἰχμαλωσία*), for which the Hellenism *διασπορά* subsequently stands.

(3) The overthrow of Athaliah and the elevation of Joash to the throne were, according to 2 Chron. xxiii. 1–11, effected by Jehoiada, through the assistance especially of the division of Levites employed in guarding the temple; while the narrative 2 Kings xi. 4–12 makes the royal body-guard his agents. On the harmonizing of the two statements, see Keil's *Commentary on the Books of Kings*, i. p. 438. The extreme brevity of the narratives in the Books of Kings is also exemplified by the notice of the appointment of Levitical guards to prevent any further desecration of the Lord's house (2 Chron. xxiii. 18 sq., comp. with 2 Kings xi. 18).

(4) The contrition shown by the people awakens the prophetic hope that the final and already approaching judgment, denounced upon Judah, may be turned against the heathen, and the return of those members of the covenant people already in dispersion, and their perfection as a spiritual church, be thus brought to pass. From the lively interest in the temple worship which characterizes this prophet, Ewald (*Prophets of the Old Covenant*, i. p. 153) thinks he was himself a priest at Jerusalem. Further evidence for the date given above will be found in the Introduction to the Old Testament. [The opinions are at present again very much divided, since many maintain the post-exilic origin of the Book of Joel; so especially Merx, *Die Prophetie des Joel und ihre Ausleger*, 1879.]

(5) The first example of the martyrdom of a prophet narrated in the Old Testament.

(6) Two anonymous prophets are mentioned under Amaziah, 2 Chron. xxv., one of whom forbids the king to use the mercenary soldiers hired by him from the northern kingdom against Edom, while the other rebukes him for introducing the idols of Edom, and is on this account dismissed with threats.

(7) Uzziah was, at the beginning of his reign, under the influence of the prophet *Zechariah* (2 Chron. xxvi. 5); but the encroachment which he subsequently attempted upon the privileges of the priests, by presuming, ver. 16 sq., in opposition to the law, Num. xviii. 7, to burn incense in the sanctuary, manifests the effort made to procure for the kingly office in Judah a position similar to that which, by its assumption of the priesthood, it occupied in the northern kingdom.

(8) In all that has preceded we meet with no *prophetic agency in Judah* which can be compared to the evidently more authoritative action of the prophets of the northern kingdom. The appearance of *Isaiah* constitutes indeed an epoch; but before proceeding to a description of his times, we must direct attention to the appearance of a new element in the development of prophetism. For with Joel, or with Obadiah,—if the latter is to be dated as early as Jehoram, that is, in the first decade of the 9th century before Christ,—*prophetic authorship* in the stricter sense, or the composition of the *prophetic books*, begins. Earlier prophets had also uttered predictions which had been written down in the historical books composed by prophets. The foundations of prophetic eschatology had already been given in a general manner in the older testimonies of revelation. Still the gaze of the earlier prophets was fixed more on the present than the future of the divine kingdom; and their words of exhortation, menace, or promise were always directed to an immediate and practical purpose. Now, however, when that movement of the nations was approaching by which Israel was to be drawn into the contests of the heathen world and punished for its apostasy, when the prophetic consciousness was awakening to the perception, first with respect to the northern kingdom, but soon afterward with respect to Judah also, that the Divine counsels of redemption could not be accomplished during the present generation, but that the present form of the theocracy must, on the contrary, be destroyed, so that, after the execution of a judicial sifting of the people, the redeemed church of the future for which the nation is destined might arise,—the prophetic word attained a significance extending far beyond the present. Misunderstood and despised for the most part by contemporaries who were lulled into vain dreams by the flattering predictions of false prophets, it was by its historical fulfilment to accredit to coming generations the living God in His power, righteous-

ness, and faithfulness, and was till then to serve as a light to the pious, by the help of which they might, during the obscurity of the approaching seasons of judgment, be enlightened concerning the ways of the kingdom of God. For this purpose, however, it was necessary that the word of prophecy should be faithfully handed down, and this could only be done by committing it to writing. This is frequently referred by the prophets to the direct command of God (Isa. viii. 1, Hab. ii. 2 sq., Jer. xxxvi. 2) ; and the purpose for which such records were made, namely, to guarantee to the coming generation the veracity of the Divine word, is expressly declared (Isa. xxx. 8, Jer. xxx. 2, comp. Isa. xxxiv. 16). In some cases the writing of a prediction was directly connected with its oral announcement, as a confirmation of the latter ; in which case it may sometimes have sufficed to write down, in the presence of witnesses, the few leading words in which its essence was comprised (viii. 1 sq.; perhaps xxx. 8 is also an example). In general, however, the literary work was carried on independently of the oral ministration ; and certain prophets, as Amos, Hosea, Micah, probably did not till toward the close of their career work up into a systematically arranged and completed whole the essential matter of the predictions uttered by them at different times, and thus bequeath to posterity a general representation of their prophetic agency. From the passages in which older and no longer extant predictions are referred to, as Isa. ii. 2–4, it may be concluded that the prophetic no less than the historical books have been incompletely transmitted to us. Mic. iv. 1–4 seems derived from an older source ; and the prophecy concerning Moab, Isa. xv. sq., is expressly stated to be a summary of former Divine predictions. The traces, however, of such older and now lost portions are by no means so abundant as Ewald (*Prophets of the Old Covenant*, ii. p. 102) assumes. Comp. on certain supposed references to earlier prophecies, the article "Prophetenthum des A. T." p. 225. Finally, the assertion of Ewald, that our present collection of prophetic books is small when compared with the actual extent of prophetic literature, and only resembles the few remaining scions of some once numerous race, is certainly based upon a gross exaggeration. The chief evidence against it lies in the fact that in the Book of Jeremiah—that *librorum sacrorum interpres atque vindex*, as Küper aptly designates him—in which these traces of lost prophetical books are chiefly said to be found, the older matter is derived from prophetic books still preserved to us.—In these remarks, one important peculiarity of the prophetic writings has been already alluded to, viz. the *connection* existing between the books,—the more recent prophets frequently appealing for confirmation of their own statements to the utterances of their predecessors, which they appropriate and enlarge upon. Thus, to cite only two examples, Amos, when foretelling judgments against the heathen nations, ch. i. 2, begins with the words of Joel iii. 16, and the later Micah with the closing words of the earlier (1 Kings xxii. 28). In almost all the prophets, references or allusions to earlier prophetic works may be pointed out, such references being comparatively most frequent in Jeremiah and Zephaniah. This circumstance, as well as the connection existing between the prophetic and historical writings, constitutes the ἀκριβὴς διαδοχή, which Josephus, *c. Ap.* i. 8, ascribes to the Old Testament prophets. They hereby testify to the oneness of spirit existing in them, to the oneness of the Divine word proclaimed by them and maintained during the greatest outward changes, and to the continued validity of their yet unfulfilled predictions.

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM AHAZ TO JOSIAH (741–639 B.C.).

§ 181.

Ahaz and Hezekiah.

The first blow fell upon the kingdom under the weak and idolatrous *Ahaz*, in the war undertaken against Judah by Rezin and Pekah, the confederate kings of Damascus and Samaria (1). The war broke out under Jotham, but seems to have been at first unaccompanied by important results. In the reign of Ahaz, however, Judah experienced a series of misfortunes. In the north, the Jewish forces were annihilated by Pekah in a terrible battle (2 Chron. xxviii. 5 sq.) ; in the south, the seaport of Elath was taken by Rezin (2 Kings xvi. 6), and the Edomites threw off the yoke, their hosts invading Judah on the south, as those of the Philistines did on the west (2 Chron. xxviii. 17 sq.). (Hence we find, in the period to which Isa. viii. refers, nothing about the militia and other warlike preparations with which Uzziah and Jotham had protected the land.) Nothing was left to the allies but to conquer Jerusalem and dethrone the house of David. Then, when the heart of Ahaz and the heart of his people were, according to the well-known passage in Isa. vii., moved as the trees of the wood are moved by the wind, the help of the God of Israel was offered him in vain by Isaiah. Incredulously and hypocritically were the prophet's words rejected, for Ahaz had already betaken himself for aid to the Assyrian conqueror Tiglath-pileser. This (as we have seen, § 176) was indeed afforded ; but Ahaz became what he had declared himself to be (2 Kings xvi. 7), the *servant* of the Assyrian monarch, and the people now came under the Assyrian rod (Isa. x. 24, 27). Under Ahaz *the worship of idols* was openly practised in Jerusalem itself (2 Kings xvi. 3 sq. ; 2 Chron. xxviii. 2 sqq. 23 ; comp. also Mic. i. 13, vi. 16) (2). Better things were to be expected of the pious and powerful Hezekiah (725–696) (3), under whom Isaiah zealously labored, and who also humbly received the testimony given at Jerusalem by the prophet Micah, the plain man from the country ; comp. the narrative Jer. xxvi. 18 sq. (4). But an inward change was not to be effected among the people by a merely external reformation of religion, and the worship of idols was only exchanged for a barren zeal for rites and sacrifices ; comp. Isa. i. 10 sqq. (5), xxix. 13, Mic. vi. 6. Moral corruption was especially rife among the upper classes of the theocracy, as is shown in the rebukes of the licentiousness of the nobles, the tyrannical administration of justice, the mercenary services of the priests and false prophets and the servile demagogism of the latter, by the prophets Isaiah and Micah ; comp. the passages, Mic. ii. 11, ch. iii., Isa. i. 15 sqq., ix. 14 sq., xxviii. 7 sq., xxix. 20 sq., etc., to which may be added the severe words addressed to Shebna, the chief minister of Hezekiah. The violent party of the nobles in Jerusalem, who continued the unfortunate policy of Ahaz, though in an opposite direction, was most pernicious to the state. Instead of patiently submitting, as Isaiah called upon them to do (comp. x. 24, 27, xxx. 15 sqq., etc.), to the Assyrian yoke as a just punishment, and expecting in faith the help of God, this party was continually

plotting to revolt from Assyria, and urging the king to ally himself with *the Egyptian kingdoms*, one of which (as appears from Isa. xxx. 4) had Tanis for its capital, and appears to have extended over Lower and Middle Egypt; while the other, consisting of Upper Egypt, was under the Cushite conqueror Tirhakah (the Tarakos of the Greeks); 2 Kings xix. 9, comp. Isa. xviii. (6). At this period, it was to Egypt and Cush that the lesser states bordering on the Mediterranean Sea generally looked for assistance against the Assyrian power, which was gradually pressing farther and farther westward (see the passage indicative of this, Isa. xx. 5) (7). The decided revolt, however, of Hezekiah from Assyria probably took place not in the reign of Shalmaneser (8), but at the time when *Sennacherib*, immediately after his accession, was engaged in campaigns against Babylon and Media (9). In the third year of his reign, however (10), we find Sennacherib resuming the project of his father (Sargon) for the conquest of Egypt, and on this occasion designing to punish Judah also for its disloyalty. When, on its march toward Egypt, the Assyrian army invaded and devastated Judah, taking fortress after fortress, Hezekiah sent ambassadors to Sennacherib to sue for peace, offering to pay all that should be demanded of him. Sennacherib appears to have been pacified, and to have imposed upon Hezekiah the enormous tribute of three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold (2 Kings xviii. 13 sqq.). It seems to me that the threatenings of Isa. xxii. 1–14 must be referred to this period, when danger was apparently averted by this payment, and Jerusalem had given itself up to frivolity and rejoicing (11). Sennacherib, however, having received the money, broke his engagement (xxxiii. 7 refers to this faithlessness of the Assyrian king), and now sent his general Tartan, with two other high officials and a portion of his army, from Lachish to Jerusalem, to demand, with insolent contempt both for Hezekiah and the God of Israel, the surrender of the capital also, on which occasion he openly announced his intention of carrying away the Jewish people (ch. xxxvi.; 2 Kings xviii. 17 sqq.). In this desperate condition (12), Hezekiah knew of no other refuge than that of prayer; and the prophet now announced an approaching act of Divine deliverance, in answer to the scornful defiance of the living God on the part of the heathen conqueror. It took place, by the destruction of the Assyrian army, on the very night before Sennacherib advanced to attack the city. This event probably occurred in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, Isa. xxxvi. sq., 2 Kings xviii. sq., 2 Chron. xxxii., and may be supposed to have been effected by a pestilence (so Josephus; comp. also the narrative 2 Sam. xxiv. 16) (13). Psalms xlvi. and lxxv. apparently refer to this deliverance of Jerusalem (14). A description of this occurrence is given from an Egyptian standpoint in Herodotus, ii. 141. The deliverance is there represented as the result of the prayer of Sethon, the priest-king of Egypt, when reduced to utter despair by Sennacherib's attack. A host of field-mice, he tells us, spread themselves by night over the Assyrian army, and gnawed the quivers and bows, and the straps of the shields, so that on the following day the now defenceless army took to flight, and a multitude of men perished. The mouse being the well-known symbol of destruction and especially of pestilence (comp. 1 Sam. vi. 4), the story may have arisen from a misunderstanding of this symbol. Herodotus further tells us that there was in the temple of Hephæstos a stone image of Sethon with a mouse in his hand (15). The Assyrian power was now so weakened, that though Manasseh, the

successor of Hezekiah, was made to feel it (probably under Esar-haddon), yet it no longer menaced Judah with any lasting injury. In its place, however, appeared, as Isaiah had, on the occasion narrated 2 Kings xx. 12 sqq., Isa. xxxix., foretold (16), the already rising Chaldee-Babylonian power, which accomplished the judgment of God against Judah,—a *Babylonian captivity* having been predicted against this nation by Micah also.

(1) This war, opening as it does a new epoch, was briefly mentioned in the history of the northern kingdom (§ 176), but must be now somewhat more particularly described. Much has been written concerning it; see especially an article by Caspari on the Syro-Ephraimitish war in the "Univ.-Programm" of Christiania, 1844, with the conclusions of which, however, I do not entirely agree; also Movers (*Kritische Untersuchungen über die Chronik*, 1834, pp. 144–155), who incorrectly applies Isa. i. to this period. The question is how to combine the different notices in 2 Kings xvi. 5 sqq. and 2 Chron. xxviii. 5 sqq., to which must be added Isa. vii.

(2) The priests themselves seem to have lent a helping hand to the king in this matter; comp. 2 Kings xvi. 10, and what Bertheau remarks on 2 Chron. xix. 34: "the Levites were more upright in heart to sanctify themselves than the priests." The priests had perhaps had a greater share in the introduction of the idolatrous worship by Ahaz, and therefore entered more slowly into the views of Hezekiah.

(3) [Comp. the art. "Hiskia" revised by Delitzsch, in the 2d ed. of Herzog, and Kleinert's art. "Hiskia" in Riehm.] The authorities for the history of the twenty-nine years' reign of Hezekiah (חִזְקִיָּהוּ or יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ, abbreviated חִזְקִיָּה or יְחִזְקִיָּה, LXX Ἐζεκίας) are 2 Kings xviii.–xx.; Isa. xxxvi.–xxxix.; 2 Chron. xxix.–xxxii.; with which must be combined the discourses of Isaiah referring to this period, and the Book of Micah, which was composed in the reign of Hezekiah, and probably during its first six years. Hezekiah zealously pursued two objects,—one, the elevation of the moral and religious condition of his people, by the destruction of idolatry and the restoration of the theocratic rites; the other, the re-establishment of the independence of his kingdom, by shaking off the Assyrian yoke. The former, viz. the reformation he effected, is mentioned in only a summary manner in 2 Kings xviii. 4, while it is, on the other hand, very circumstantially described 2 Chron. xxix. sqq. According to the latter, Hezekiah, so early as in the first month of the new year beginning after his accession to the throne (so xxix. 3 is to be understood; see Bertheau *in loc.* and Caspari, *Beitr. zur Einl. in das Buch Jesaja*, p. 111), had the temple purified by priests and Levites, and then broke in pieces the brazen serpent made by Moses (§ 30), to which the people had burned incense, 2 Kings xviii. 4. The worship of Jehovah was restored by solemn sacrifices, by means of which atonement was first made for the people, and then praise- and thank-offerings were offered to God by the reconciled people. A great *Passover* was, according to 2 Chron. xxx., afterward held, to which not only the subjects of the kingdom of Judah, but also all the members of the other tribes still dwelling in Palestine were invited, though but few availed themselves of the opportunity. Before the commencement of the festival, the idolatrous altars in Jerusalem were destroyed; and after it, all who had taken part in its celebration proceeded to destroy the monuments of idolatry throughout the country. On the probable date of the above Passover, see § 177; for the different views, see the article in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* vi. p. 152. In whatever year, however, this Passover may have been held, it is certain, from the numerous intimations in Micah and Isaiah (see them as collected in Caspari, *id.* p. 56 sq.), that in the earlier years of Hezekiah the worship of idols must have been still widely disseminated in Judah. Subsequently, too, though no heathen nor any kind of anti-theocratic worship was any longer tolerated, it was apparently as impossible as in former reformations to enforce a total extirpation of idolatry; and we find also, from 2 Kings xxiii. 13, that neither was the entire destruction of the ancient high places effected. [Against Wellhausen's position (i. p. 26),

that the attempt of Hezekiah to destroy the other sanctuaries which existed along with the temple had no result, and therefore admits of question, comp. Is. xxxvi. 7. For the assertion that "it is certain that the prophet Isaiah did not labor to set aside the high places," he has no better proof than Is. xxx. 22, "ye shall defile also the covering of your graven images of silver and the ornament of your molten images of gold . . . 'Get ye hence,' will ye say thereto," on which he rests the conclusion: "if he hopes therefore that Jehovah's places of worship will be cleansed of superstitious stuff, it is clear that he does not propose to destroy them."] We are further told, 2 Chron. xxxi., of the provision made by Hezekiah for the establishment of the restored rites of worship, and especially for the maintenance of the priests and Levites. Further particulars concerning this matter, and other notices referring to the priests and Levites of Hezekiah's times, will be found in the article "Leviten und Priester" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* viii. p. 356 sq.

(4) See the explanation of the passage in Caspari, *Ueber Micha den Morasthiten*, p. 56. The occurrence must have taken place in the earlier years of Hezekiah.

(5) I take it for granted that the preface to Isaiah, ch. i., was written not in the reign of Uzziah or Jotham, but in that of Hezekiah, i. 7, which it would be unnatural to regard as a prediction, being utterly unsuitable to the former reigns, or to that of Ahaz, to whose times i. 10 sqq. has also no application.

(6) It is probable that this policy was secretly pursued by the court at Jerusalem from the beginning of Hezekiah's reign. Ver. 15 of Isa. xx., which certainly belongs to this earlier period, may allude to this fact.

(7) See the full discussion of the political relations of the times in Movers, *Phönicier*, ii. 1, p. 393 sqq. [Also Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, i. p. 92 sq., and Strachey, *Jewish History and Politics in the Times of Sargon and Sennacherib*, London, 1874.]

(8) This cannot be admitted, because it would be incomprehensible that Shalmaneser, when destroying the northern kingdom, should have spared Judah, if it also had broken faith with him. The expeditions of Shalmaneser [and his successor Sargon] against Samaria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, may certainly have affected Judah; but of an Assyrian attack of Judea at this period we hear absolutely nothing.

(9) On the former, see Brandis, *Ueber den historischen Gewinn aus der Entzifferung der assyrischen Inschriften*, p. 44 sqq.

(10) According to the usual chronology, 712 or 711; according to Brandis, 700; according to Movers, even 691 B.C. [The usual reckoning which rests on the biblical statement that the invasion of Sennacherib occurred in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah (Is. xxxvi. 1) cannot well be correct, since Sennacherib ascended the throne in the year 705, and after Sargon's reign of sixteen years, who became king about 722. Comp. the art. "Hiskia" in Herzog, 2d. ed. and especially Schrader, art. "Sanherib" in Riehm; on Sennacherib's account of his undertaking against Jerusalem, see Buddensieg, *Die assyr. Ausgrabungen und das A. Testament*, p. 60 sqq.].

(11) Caspari, *Beiträge*, p. 153 sq., places this passage somewhat earlier. It has in fact been assigned to every possible place. Isa. i. may also have been written about this time. See further particulars in the article quoted, p. 153 sq.

(12) Hezekiah indeed zealously used every means for the defence of the city, 2 Chron. xxxii. 3–6 (comp. Isa. xxii. 9–11, in which latter passage the former appears to be introductory. See on this matter the article quoted, p. 154. But notwithstanding all, the situation of Jerusalem was, humanly speaking, past help. "This day is a day of trouble, and of rebuke, and of blasphemy; for the children are come to the birth, and there is not strength to bring forth," are the words in which Hezekiah, Isa. xxxvii. 3, describes the anxiety and despairing efforts of those days. The danger was enhanced when Sennacherib, on the report of the approach of Tirhakah, departed with his army from Lachish to Libnah, which was nearer to Jerusalem, and was now obliged by prudential reasons to make the most strenuous efforts to overcome Jerusalem, for the sake of securing his rear, Isa. xxxvii. 8 sqq., 2 Kings xix. 8 sqq.

(13) Isa. xxxvii. 36 sq., 2 Kings xix. 35 sq. : "And the angel of the Lord went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand : and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned and dwelt at Nineveh." For further particulars concerning the date and place of the Assyrian overthrow, see p. 155 of the above article.

(14) That the surrounding heathen nations also received, as Isaiah had predicted, xviii. 7, some idea of the greatness of the God of Israel, is shown by the notice, 2 Chron. xxxii. 23 : "Many brought gifts unto the Lord to Jerusalem, and presents to Hezekiah king of Judah : so that he was magnified in the sight of all nations from henceforth" (comp. Ps. lxxvi. 12). This event is also frequently mentioned in later writings, viz. Tob. i. 18, according to which Sennacherib, when he fled from Judah, is said in his rage to have put many Jews to death in Nineveh ; also 1 Macc. vii. 41 ; 2 Macc. viii. 19 ; 3 Macc. vi. 5.

(15) See, in illustration, Hitzig, *Urgeschichte und Mythologie der Philistäer*, p. 201 sq. It is also very probable that two different occurrences are, as Ewald supposes, *Hist. of Israel*, iv. 180 sqq., alluded to in Herodotus and in the Old Testament. See the above article, p. 155. Isa. xxxviii. and 2 Kings xx. connect the account of Hezekiah's mortal illness and miraculous cure immediately with the destruction of the Assyrian host. [But the sickness and the embassy of Merodach Baladan, which followed it, appear to have occurred at an earlier period. Comp. Delitzsch, art. "Hiskia" in Herzog, ed. 2.] We have no full account of the *second half of Hezekiah's reign* in the Old Testament. The interest in the ancient sacred literature which Hezekiah was the means of reviving should be mentioned (comp. Drechsler, *Jesaja*, ii. 2, p. 221, and § 169 with note 3). He prescribed the use of the Psalms in public worship, 2 Chron. xxix. 30. On the whole, 2 Kings xviii. 5 awards to this king the commendation that "after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him."

(16) See on this narrative the article cited, p. 156 sq. [For the light cast on this period from Assyrian sources, cf. Schrader, *Keilinschriften und A. T. ;* Rawlinson, *Monarchies*, vol. ii. ; *Records of the Past*, vol. i.–v.—D.]

§ 182.

Manasseh and Amon.

Judah was fast ripening for judgment under the two kings *Manasseh* (696–641) and *Amon* (641–639), who systematically set to work to overthrow the worship of Jehovah, and to establish the undisputed supremacy of idolatry. The conversion of Manasseh, related 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, seems to have produced no decided effect upon the people, and its results were at all events frustrated by Amon. (1). The heathenism prevailing in Judah had, however, since the days of Ahaz, attained under Assyrian influence a new character. The old Canaanitish adoration of Baal, Ashera, and Astarte still, indeed, continued (see especially 2 Kings xxi. 3, 7). This was, however, subordinate to the *Assyrian worship of fire and the heavenly bodies*, which now occupied the foreground. It is true that the Canaanitish (or Phœnician) worship of nature had also reference to the stars, inasmuch as they were regarded as depositaries of the powers of nature, and as the originators of all the developments and occurrences of nature. In the star-worship of Upper Asia, on the contrary, arising as it did from the Magism which tolerated no images, this dualistic origin is banished, the stars not being regarded as producing and generating powers, but only as the governors and conductors of sublunary affairs, —a notion from which astrology was developed. It was probably in connection

with the worship introduced from Upper Asia, of the fire-gods Adrammelech and Anammelech (2), to whom children were burned, xvii. 31, that the worship of Moloch, with its sacrifices of children, formerly disseminated among the people, but now for several centuries abandoned, was resumed in Judah. Ahaz had already devoted himself to it (xvi. 3), and its chief seat was the valley of the son of Hinnom at Jerusalem (xxiii. 10 ; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6 ; Jer. vii. 13, and other passages). Ahaz also built, according to 2 Kings xxiii. 12, altars for the worship of "the sun, the moon, and all the host of heaven," which were undoubtedly destroyed by Hezekiah ; and he may perhaps have mingled such worship with that of Jehovah,—at least what is told us xvi. 10 sqq. may be so understood. Under Manasseh, however, altars for the worship of the stars were erected throughout Jerusalem ; and the temple itself was dedicated to this and to the service of Ashera (xxi. 5, xxiii. 5, 11 ; Jer. vii. 30, comp. with viii. 2, etc.). That the religious life of the people was, by the introduction of the Upper Asian worship, raised to a higher stage of development, as Vatke *e.g.* asserts, is an utterly preposterous theory ; the effect was only to increase the already existing religious syncretism, which is always a sign of weakness. From the standpoint of prophecy, the worship of the host of heaven was quite as decidedly condemned as the Canaanitish idolatry (Jer. viii. 3 ; Zeph. i. 5 ; Ezek. viii. 15–17 ; 2 Kings xvii. 16 ; comp. also Job xxxi. 26–28). It is true that both *priests and prophets* participated in the universal degeneration of religious life (see Zeph. iii. 4 ; Jer. ii. 8, 26 sq.) (3) ; but while no trace of resistance to the abominations of Manasseh is to be discovered on the part of the priesthood, there were at least prophets who raised their voices against them, 2 Kings xxi. 10, and were among the innocent blood with which Manasseh, according to ver. 16 and xxiv. 4, filled Jerusalem. For it is with reference to these times that Jeremiah says, ch. ii. 30 : "your own sword hath devoured your prophets like a destroying lion" (comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* x. 3. 1). According to tradition, Isaiah was also among the victims of Manasseh. It was because the prophets sealed their testimony with their blood that no written prophetic testimony of this date has come down to us (4). It was "the sins of Manasseh" (as is now the usual expression, 2 Kings xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, and other passages) which, unatoned for and unpardoned, from henceforth lay as a burden upon the people, though better times once more appeared.

(1) [On the confirmation of the account in Chronicles by the cuneiform inscriptions, comp. Kleinert, art. "Manasse" in Riehm, F. W. Schultz in Zöckler, i. p. 283, H. Schultz, p. 762. But if the latter and Reuss, § 268, doubt the conversion of Manasseh, on the ground of passages like 2 K. xxiii. 26. xxiv. 3, Jer. xv. 4, reference may be made, on the other hand, to 1 K. xxi. 28 sq., where it is said that by his humbling himself, the sins of Ahab and his house were not expiated, but only his personal punishment was mitigated.]

(2) [Comp. the articles of Schrader in Riehm.]

(3) According to 2 Kings xxiii. 8, besides the כְּמָרִים appointed (ver. 5) by the kings of Judah, Levitical priests must also have participated in the idolatrous worship at the high places. Nay, if the description given Ezek. viii. 14 sqq. is, as Hitzig supposes, to be referred to the time of Manasseh, the entire priesthood, as represented by its heads (comp. § 166, note 7), had surrendered itself to idolatry.

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM JOSIAH TO THE OVERTHROW OF THE STATE (639–588).

§ 183.

Josiah.

This period opens with the last struggle of the theocratic principle against the idolatry and immorality of the people, and with the last temporary elevation of the kingdom under *Josiah* (1). King Amon having fallen a victim to a conspiracy, the people arose, slew the conspirators, and placed Josiah, a child of eight years old, and son of the murdered monarch, on the throne. In the eighth year of his reign, says the here more particular account of Chronicles (2 Chron. xxxiv.), Josiah, then a youth of sixteen, began to seek after the God of David his father, and in his twelfth year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from idolatrous worship, the places for sacrificing to Moloch in the valley of Hinnom being then also destroyed and profaned (2). The reform inaugurated was not, however, thoroughly carried out till his eighteenth year. For then, at the purging and restoration of the temple, Hilkiah the high priest found the *book of the law*, which during the sixty years' public supremacy of heathenism had fallen into oblivion. The king was struck with fear when he heard the curses threatened for apostasy, and the words of the prophetess Huldah, to whom he had sent to inquire (2 Kings xxii. 11 sq.). The most strenuous measures were now taken for the complete extirpation of idolatry, and extended even beyond the limits of the kingdom to the towns of the Samaritan district, the people being again bound to the covenant of their fathers, and a solemn Passover held (3). Upon this finding of the book of the law in the reign of Josiah, the following hypotheses have been founded :— That by the book of the law we are only to understand a *portion* of the Pentateuch, and that at this time, *Deuteronomy*, or a part of it, was fabricated, and interpolated by the priests, with the assistance of the prophets, in the interest of the reforms now undertaken. This, which is the hypothesis of Gramberg, P. von Bohlen, and others, receives no kind of support from the narrative (4), though it is probably true that the threats which alarmed the king were those contained in Deuteronomy xxviii. But to affirm that the author of the Book of Kings speaks only of the finding of a portion of the law, and that it is inconceivable that the rest of the Pentateuch, if it existed, should have been put aside, is most groundless and arbitrary. That the law, of which by reason of the state of ancient literature but few copies might exist, should have fallen into oblivion in the sixty years during which the worship of Jehovah had been abrogated as the religion of the state, is so little inconceivable, that the contrary would rather be a matter of astonishment (5). This last reformation, which, in spite of the severity accompanying it, was unable to extirpate the secret worship of idols, to say nothing of the heathen inclinations of the people, effected only an external prevalence of the forms of the legitimate worship, but was unable to produce in the degenerate nation a real purification of faith and morals. It was, as Jeremiah says, iii. 20, a turning not with the whole heart, but feignedly,—a sanctimonious hypocrisy, which re-

garded the external restoration of the worship of God as sufficient. Even the ruins of Samaria, testifying as they did to the severity of God's penal judgments, only served to confirm the delusion that the Divine protection was the more firmly pledged to Judah, and thus to harden them in their carnal security (comp. *e.g.* the stern address of the prophet Jeremiah, vii. 1–15, in reply to the boast, "The temple of the Lord is here"). The *priests* had indeed, as previously under Hezekiah (§ 181, note 3), offered themselves to the king as instruments in this reformation; but falsehood and hypocrisy, and a generally coarse and profane disposition, characterized the priesthood in these days (comp. the passages Jer. v. 31, vi. 13, viii. 10, xxiii. 11) (6). And while the priests were treating the law itself with neglect, nay, incurring the guilt of grossly violating it (Ezek. xxii. 26), and falsifying it by the manner in which they interpreted it (Jer. viii. 8), they boasted of it, and of those legal rites which guaranteed the permanence of the state, and whose continuance could be secured only by themselves, for "The law cannot perish from the priest," xviii. 18; comp. also vii. 4 sqq., viii. 11, etc. Still it must not be forgotten that the fact that such men as the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel were found in the priestly order, is a proof that a sacred germ must have existed in the degenerate priesthood (see also Ezek. xliv. 15). Upon *Jeremiah* especially, whose call in the thirteenth year of Josiah (Jer. i. 2, xxv. 3) was nearly contemporary with the appearance of *Zephaniah* and the commencement of Josiah's reforms, devolved at this period the advocacy of the cause of God (7). After the renewal of the covenant, he undertook, as appears from xi. 1–8, by earnest addresses, to make the people of Jerusalem and of the cities of Judah conscious of the gravity of the obligation they had taken upon themselves. His testimony now accompanied the fate of the people till the fulfilment of the inevitable and approaching judgment, for the purpose of saving, by his incisive exhortations to repentance, any of the demoralized race who might still be willing to hearken.

(1) The chief authorities for the reign of Josiah are 2 Kings xxii. sq., and 2 Chron. xxxiv. sq., in combining which the account in Chronicles must be regarded as fundamental (as was first pointed out by Movers), 2 Kings having either transposed the records employed, or ch. xxii. 3 sq. being a merely summary account.

(2) Among the later Jews, the valley of Hinnom, Γεέννα, was the symbol, and its name the name, of hell.

(3) When it is said of this *Passover*, 2 Kings xxiii. 22, "There was not holden such a passover, from the days of the judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the kings of Israel, nor of the kings of Judah," it is not implied, as Thenius thinks, that the first celebration of the Passover after the days of the judges took place in the reign of Josiah, but only that a Passover so solemn, and in every respect so strictly in conformity with the law, had not been held in all this interval; even that held under Hezekiah (§ 181, note 3), *e.g.*, had not equalled it; see Bertheau on 2 Chron. xxxv. 27, and Keil, *Apologet. Versuch über die Chronik*, p. 399 sq. Comp. also the similar passage concerning the Feast of Tabernacles, Neh. viii. 17. Thenius (*id.*) is equally incorrect when he further asserts that Ezekiel is *the first*, and, on the whole, *the only* prophet who mentions the Passover; for Isa. xxx. 29 must, according to the whole context, be referred to the celebration of the Passover. And how would the expression in Isa. xxix. 1 apply, if only one annual festival, viz. the Feast of Tabernacles, had been kept at Jerusalem?

(4) [The position that Deuteronomy was not merely found, but was actually composed shortly before the reformation under Josiah, is at present widely accepted, and constitutes one of the most important props of the Reuss and Graf school

of criticism. Although, if this position were established, it would not prove the correctness of that school, yet the latter would certainly be disproved by the refutation of the former. On the importance of this position, comp. *e.g.* Kayser, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Pentateuchfrage," in the *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.* 1881, p. 340 sqq., and Reuss § 286]. Ewald makes Deuteronomy to have been written at least 30–40 years earlier (in Egypt), against which are the traces of Deuteronomic laws found even in the kingdom of the ten tribes, and the use made of Deuteronomy by the oldest prophets whose books have come down to us. [On the contrary, Delitzsch (in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, 1881) endeavors to sustain the view that the oratorical and historical portion of Deuteronomy was composed out of what was handed down by tradition in a more concise form, which the writer of Deuteronomy, in the consciousness of spiritual agreement with Moses, expanded and shaped in accordance with his position and aim, and that the legislative portion "is the transmitted legislation of the fortieth year, which the Deuteronomist reproduced in accordance with the religious and moral needs of his time." In regard to the date of this process, he goes no further than to say that Deuteronomy, because referred to by the prophets a century before the time of Josiah, is certainly earlier than Isaiah.]

(5) A parallel instance is afforded by the non-acquaintance with the Bible which existed before the Reformation, not only among the people, but also among the priests,—Luther, *e.g.*, when a student at Erfurt, imagining the postils to contain the whole of Holy Scripture: and this notwithstanding the existence of innumerable copies, the Latin Bible having been more frequently printed than any other book. Let matters only be managed among ourselves for sixty years as many wish, and we should see how much knowledge of the gospel would be left among the people.

(6) It was chiefly with the priests that *Jeremiah* had from the very first to contend, i. 18, and hence, though himself of the priestly race, he was constantly the object of their hatred and persecution (xi. 21, xxvi. 7 sqq.).

(7) A faithful picture of the life of a prophet may be obtained from the Book of Jeremiah.

§ 184.

Profane History at this Period (1). *Death of Josiah. Jehoahaz.*

The incursion of the Scythians into Upper Asia (Herodot. i. 104 sq.), which took place in the time of Josiah, seems only to have affected the borders of Judah, and to have caused no lasting danger to the kingdom itself. It is not mentioned in the historical books of the Old Testament, and it is more than doubtful whether the prophecy of Zephaniah and Jer. iv. 27 refer to it. On the other hand, Judah was involved in the great battles which arose in connection with the fall of Nineveh. In Egypt, Psammetichus, who had strengthened the military power of the kingdom, was succeeded by Necho, who must have been the more inclined to resume his father's plans of conquest, which, as the account given Herodot. ii. 157 of the siege of Ashdod shows, were directed against Upper Asia, inasmuch as the state of affairs held out the prospect of sharing with the Medes and Babylonians, who were attacking Nineveh, the rich inheritance of the falling Assyrian kingdom. Necho appeared with an army in Palestine in 609, but with an express declaration that he was waging war with Assyria only (2 Chron. xxxv. 21). Of course he desired not to be attacked in the rear on his march to the Euphrates. Josiah, however, was unwilling that Egyptian supremacy should be established in Hither Asia, and, advancing against Necho, sought to obstruct his march. A battle was fought between them at *Megiddo*, on the plain of Jezreel (comp. Hero-

dot. ii. 159); the Jewish army was defeated, and Josiah, mortally wounded, died soon after at Jerusalem (2 Kings xxiii. 29; 2 Chron. xxxv. 20–25) (2). With him fell the last hope of the sinking state, on which account the mourning for Josiah became a proverb for the heaviest affliction (comp. Zech. xii. 11). Necho did not, it seems, at once follow up his victory over Judah, but hastened to the Euphrates. Meantime Jehoahaz (in Jer. xxii. 11 called Shallum), a younger son of Josiah, was raised by the popular choice to the throne, upon which *Eliakim*, the elder son, gave himself up to Necho. Jehoahaz was, after a reign of three months, summoned to the Egyptian camp at Riblah, on the northern boundary of Palestine, and there imprisoned, while Eliakim was set up in his stead as an Egyptian vassal king, by the name of *Jehoiakim*. Jehoahaz was afterward removed to Egypt, where he died (2 Chron. xxxvi. 1–4; 2 Kings xxiii. 31–35; Jer. xxii. 10–12).

(1) [Comp. on this and the following sections, Ranke, i. p. 113, sqq.]
(2) Jeremiah, we are told, 2 Chron. xxxv. 25, "lamented for Josiah; and all the singing-men and singing-women spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day."

§ 185.

Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin. (1).

In *Jehoiakim* Judah received a king who surpassed the worst of his ancestors in badness. By his love of pomp and splendor, his already impoverished people were still further exhausted (comp. the description, Jer. xxii. 13–19. Idolatry was again openly practised, and all the reforms of Josiah were obliterated. A grievous period of affliction and persecution now set in for *Jeremiah*, who, though he experienced much hostility, and that indeed from his own family, seems to have exercised his public ministry without restraint under Josiah. At the first accusation, indeed, of blasphemy, brought against him after an address in the court of the temple, in which he had predicted the approaching destruction of the city and temple, he was acquitted (1), while the prophet Urijah, who had fled to Egypt to escape the wrath of the king, was brought back and executed (Jer. xxvi). But from henceforth disgrace and persecution were heaped upon the prophet, who undauntedly and incessantly contended against the prevailing idolatry and wickedness, against the tyranny of the nobles, and against the degenerate priests and false prophets, who now appeared in great numbers, and sought by their deceptions to invalidate the testimony of the true prophet. After the destruction of Nineveh in 606 (2), in which the prophecy of *Nahum*, probably a younger contemporary of Isaiah, was fulfilled, *things took a new turn in Hither Asia.* The aspiring Chaldean power was not inclined to allow the Egyptians to establish themselves here; and in the fourth year of Jehoiakim (605) a decisive battle, in which Necho suffered a total defeat, was fought at Carchemish (the Circesium of the Greeks), a fortress situated on the Euphrates, comp. Jer. xlvi. 1–12, between the Egyptian and Chaldean armies, the latter of which was commanded by Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabopolassar (3). After this victory, all Hither Asia as far as Pelusium fell into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Kings xxiv. 7, comp. with Jer. xlvii. 6 sq. (4). Jeremiah now announced, in the spirit of prophecy, the purpose for which the Chaldean power was appointed by God, and its predetermined duration of

seventy years (ch. xxv.). In this discourse the prophet hands, in the name of the Lord, the cup of trembling to all nations; and, last of all, Sheshach, *i.e.* Babylon, is also made to drink thereof (5). On the borders of Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar received the intelligence of his father's death, and, according to Berosus, hastened immediately back to Babylon, accompanied by only a few followers. It cannot be determined from the Book of Jeremiah that Nebuchadnezzar came to Jerusalem during this campaign. The passage Jer. xxxv. 11 (where, however, it is only said that Nebuchadnezzar came up into *the land*), comp. with ver. 1, may refer to this period; and the day of fasting and supplication, mentioned xxxvi. 9 as taking place in the fifth year of Jehoiakim, points to some great peril as either then threatening or as just passed away from Jerusalem. On the other hand, according to Dan. i. 1, Nebuchadnezzar took possession of Jerusalem, and carried off to Babylon a part of the vessels of the temple (which is confirmed by 2 Chron. xxxvi. 7), and certain noble youths,—a statement agreeing with that of Berosus in Josephus, *Antiq.* x. 1, that the Chaldean army followed Nebuchadnezzar, who had hastened on before, bringing with it captives from Judah to Babylon. But the date in Daniel which makes this take place in the third year of Jehoiakim, *i.e.* before the battle of Carchemish, cannot be easily combined with dates elsewhere given (6). Jehoiakim himself was, according to 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, put in chains by Nebuchadnezzar, to be taken to Babylon, but afterward left behind as the vassal of the Chaldean empire. Three years after, Jehoiakim rebelled (2 Kings xxiv. 1), and was then attacked by a Chaldean army reinforced from other nations, and died, it seems, during the war, 599 or 598 B.C. His son *Jehoiachin* then succeeded, but was dethroned after a reign of three months by Nebuchadnezzar, who now came against him in person, and carried him away, together with the nobles, men of war, and priests, to Babylon. This was the *second deportation*, and by it the better portion of the people was taken into captivity; see the vision of the two baskets of figs, Jer. xxiv. (7). Among those carried to Babylon was *Ezekiel*, who from the fifth year of his captivity onward filled the office of prophet to the exiles at Chebar, § 188. Nebuchadnezzar made Mattaniah, a still remaining son of Josiah, his vassal-king, changing his name to *Zedekiah* (2 Kings xxiv. 8–17; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9 sq.; Jer. xxii. 24–30).

(1) [On this and the following section, comp. Schrader, art. "Nebukadnezar" in Riehm.]

(2) This year has been arrived at after much discussion: formerly the fall of Nineveh was placed as early as 625.

(3) Jeremiah thus triumphantly announces the overthrow of their ancient enemy, xlvi. 10–26: "This is the day of the Lord God of hosts, a day of vengeance. . . . The Lord God of hosts hath a sacrifice in the north country by the river Euphrates. Go up into Gilead, and fetch balm, O virgin daughter of Egypt; in vain shalt thou use many medicines, for thou shalt not be cured. The nations have heard of thy shame, and thy cry hath filled the land."

(4) Jer. xlvii. 6 sq.: "O thou sword of the Lord, how long will it be ere thou be quiet? put up thyself into thy scabbard, rest, and be still. How can it be quiet, seeing the Lord hath given it a charge against Ashkelon, and against the seashore? there hath He appointed it."

(5) In Jeremiah is found the so-called *Athbash*. This is the name of the figure by which the alphabet is used backward, for the purpose of transposing words. Thus ת is used for א, ש for ב, etc. This makes שֵׁשַׁךְ the mystic name for בָּבֶל.

(6) It is one of the most difficult questions with reference to the Book of Daniel, how the statement with which it begins is to be understood. If all artifices are rejected, a chronological error must be admitted. [But see Zöckler's Introduction to Daniel in Lange, p. 32, note 2, where the proleptical view is stated and defended.—D.] Bertheau (on 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6) is inclined, like Gumpach, to find the inaccuracy not in Daniel, but in Jeremiah's statement concerning the battle of Carchemish, xlvi. 2, which seems to me rash. In fact, this is a point which will never be cleared up; see also Zündel, *Krit. Untersuch. über die Abfassungszeit des Buches Daniel*, 1861, p. 19 sqq. On the other difficulties found in the statements concerning Jehoiakim, see especially M. von Niebuhr, *Gesch. des Assurs und Babels*, p. 375 sq.

(7) The one basket, filled with good first-ripe figs, represents the captives in Babylon as the better part; the other, filled with bad figs, signifies the people still remaining in Judah.

§ 186.

Zedekiah. Fall of the State and of Jerusalem.

Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, was a weak prince, who lived in shameful dependence upon the low upstarts who had now seized upon power. He had sworn fealty to Nebuchadnezzar (2 Chron. xxxvi. 13), and had testified his submission to him, both by an embassy in the beginning of his reign (Jer. xxix. 3) and a personal visit to Babylon in the fourth year (li. 59). It was then that *Jeremiah* wrote his prophecy of the future destruction of Babylon, ch. l. sq., when, as is therein declared, the hammer of the world should be broken in pieces by a mightier, and delivered it to the royal courier (שַׂר־מְנוּחָה, ver. 59, is the official name; translated, a quiet prince, A. V.) to read it in Babylon, and then to cast the roll, after binding a stone to it, into the river Euphrates (1). But the king's party was meditating a revolt from Babylon, and a consultation with the ambassadors of certain neighboring states took place at Jerusalem at this very time (Jer. xxvii. 3) (2). In vain did Jeremiah warn them, by repeatedly declaring the Divine appointment of Nebuchadnezzar to be the instrument of judgment to Judah and the surrounding nations (3). The *lying prophets*, who both in Jerusalem and among the Jews already in captivity predicted the speedily approaching end of the Babylonian servitude, found more willing listeners (Jer. xxvii.–xxix.) (4). In the ninth year of his reign, Zedekiah at last openly broke his oath, and concluded an alliance with the Egyptian king Hophra (elsewhere called Apries). Then *Ezekiel* uttered from his captivity his threatening words concerning Jerusalem,—ch. xvii. and xxi. belonging to this period (5). Before the Egyptian monarch had yet completed his preparations, Nebuchadnezzar appeared with an army in Palestine (Jer. xxxiv. 1–7); the country towns were destroyed, the fortresses surrounded, and Jerusalem prepared for an obstinate resistance. *Jeremiah* counselled the surrender of the city. But when the Chaldean army marched against the now advancing Hophra, the newly awakened arrogance of the ruling party no longer heeded any warning. Jeremiah was cast into prison, but secretly released by the king, and kept in the court of the prison (ch. xxxvii.). When, on the return of the Chaldean army, he renewed his threatening announcements, he was cast by the princes into a dungeon that he might there perish with hunger. Being again delivered by the king, he in vain entreated him to sur-

render to the Chaldees, ch. xxxviii. While, however, notwithstanding the heroic defence of the city, its danger was daily increasing, and famine was raging terribly among the besieged (comp. Lam. ii. 20, iv. 9 sq.), the voice of the prophet was lifted up in the midst of the misery that surrounded him, to proclaim with exulting confidence the glorious future awaiting the chosen people and the city of God, and to prophesy, while the ancient form of the theocracy was being destroyed and the throne of David trampled under foot, concerning the new covenant and the righteous Branch of David, Jer. xxx.–xxxiii. (6). After a siege of eighteen months, a breach was made in the fortifications. Zedekiah, with a portion of his forces, endeavored to escape, but was brought back to Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah, and, after his sons had been executed before his eyes, was deprived of his sight and taken in chains to Babylon, xxxix. 1–7 ; 2 Kings xxv. 1–7 ; comp. also Ezek. xii. 13 (7). *The destruction of Jerusalem and the third deportation of the people* was effected by the Chaldee general Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv. 8 sqq.; Jer. xxxix. 8 sqq.), 588 B.C. The city and temple were burning from the seventh day of the month Ab (the fifth month of the Mosaic year) till the tenth, when their destruction was completed, according to Josephus, on the same day of the month on which the temple was, 658 years afterward, burned by Titus (8). With ferocious exultation, the neighboring states, and especially the Edomites, hastened to the spot, to feast their eyes upon the spectacle of the fall of this detested people, Ps. cxxxvii. 7, Lam. iv. 21, Ezek. xxxv. 15, xxxvi. 5. The fugitives were pursued to the mountains, and laid wait for in the wilderness, Lam. iv. 19, and had to "eat their bread with the peril of their lives," v. 9 (8).

(1) A symbolical transaction, by which it was meant to declare that, as surely as this prophecy was now lying in the bed of the river, so surely was the fate of Babylon determined.

(2) It is acknowledged that in Jer. xxvii. 1, where we read Jehoiakim instead of Zedekiah, we have either a clerical error, or that this preface belongs to some other passage. Vers. 3 and 12 expressly state that this transaction occurred under Zedekiah. According to xxviii. 1, it must be assumed that the congress took place in the fourth year of Zedekiah.

(3) Jeremiah now again advocated that policy of endurance and waiting which forbade all arbitrary self-help, and regarded faithful adherence to an oath, even though taken to the heathen oppressor, as an absolute duty.

(4) According to Jer. xxviii., the special opponent of Jeremiah was the false prophet Hananiah, to whom, when, though warned, he persevered in his lying predictions, Jeremiah, in conformity with the penalty to be inflicted on false prophets (Deut. xviii. 20), announced his approaching death, which actually ensued. How emphatically Jeremiah warned the Jews already in captivity against demagogues appearing in the guise of prophets, is seen Jer. xxix., where *Ahab*, *Zedekiah*, and *Shemaiah* are named as such lying prophets ; comp. Ezek. xiii., where ver. 9 shows that prophets appearing among the *exiles* are intended. It is worthy of note that, according to vers. 17–23, false prophesying was especially practised by Jewish women, who made a lucrative traffic of predictions in the name of Jehovah.

(5) See *e.g.* Ezek. xvii. 15 sqq. : "Shall he prosper? shall he escape that doeth such things? or shall he break the covenant, and be delivered? As I live, saith the Lord God, surely in the place where the king dwelleth that made him king, whose oath he despised, and whose covenant he brake, even with him in the midst of Babylon shall he die."

(6) It is said *e.g.* Jer. xxxiii. 10 sq. : "Again shall be heard in this place, of which ye say, it is desolate, . . . the voice of joy, and the voice of gladness, . . . the voice of them that say, Praise the Lord of hosts : for the Lord is good ; for His mercy endureth for ever."

(7) Ezekiel declares, xii. 13, of Zedekiah, "I will bring him to Babylon, to the land of the Chaldeans : *yet he shall not see it*, and he shall die there,"—a prediction which was in this manner fulfilled.

(8) Many place Obad. 10–14 here ; but I am among those who regard Obadiah as an earlier prophet. According to Jer. lii. 28, those carried away under Jehoiachin amounted to 3023 : while in 2 Kings xxiv. 10–16, on the other hand, the numbers are computed at 18,000. In Jer. lii. 29, it is said that at the last carrying into captivity only 832 were taken from Jerusalem. Probably only heads of families are reckoned in the passage in Jeremiah. It is not to be wondered at that the numbers were no greater, when it is remembered how many had perished by famine and the sword, and what numbers had fled from the city.

§ 187.

Gedaliah (1) *and the Remnant of the People.*

A remnant of the people, among whom was *Jeremiah*, who was by Nebuchadnezzar's express command treated with the greatest respect (Jer. xxxix. 11–14, xl. 1–6), was left in the land ; and fields and vineyards were assigned to them by Nebuzaradan, xxxix. 10. Nebuchadnezzar placed over them as his viceroy, *Gedaliah* a son of the prince Ahikam, who appears, 2 Kings xxii. 12, in high official position under Josiah, and to whom Jeremiah owed his deliverance when accused under Jehoiakim (Jer. xxiv. 24, comp. ver. 16) (2). Gedaliah, with a small Chaldee garrison, took up his abode at Mizpah, in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (3). After the departure of the Chaldean army (see Jer. xl. 7 sqq., 2 Kings xxv. 22 sqq.), a great number of Jews, who had by reason of the war been scattered in the neighboring countries, returned to Judea. Certain Jewish captains also, and others who had borne arms against the Chaldeans, settled at Mizpah, where they were kindly received by Gedaliah, who promised them pardon and protection if they would submit to the Chaldeans. The viceroyship of Gedaliah, however, which had held out to a considerable portion of the people the prospect of the peaceable possession of their native soil, lasted only two months. One of these captains, *Ishmael* the son of Nethaniah, of the seed royal, instigated by Baalis king of the Ammonites, placed himself at the head of a conspiracy against Gedaliah, who, not esteeming so base a treachery possible, and therefore rejecting the warning given him of it, was, together with the Chaldeans and Jews dwelling with him at Mizpah, slain during a banquet at which he was entertaining the conspirators (the circumstances are related Jer. xli. 1 sqq., comp. 2 Kings xxv. 25) (4). The Jews who were hardly yet settled, fearing the vengeance of Nebuchadnezzar, determined, in spite of the warnings of *Jeremiah*, to emigrate to *Egypt*, whither the prophet also followed them. Surrendering themselves in Egypt to the worship of idols, to the neglecting of which they attributed the misfortunes of Judea (see the remarkable passage, Jer. xliv. 17 sqq.), Jeremiah was here also constrained to exercise his office of reprover, and probably terminated his storm-tossed life in that country (ch. xl.–xliv. belong to this period) (5). His predictions (xliii. 8–14, xliv. 30) were fulfilled, for in the fifth year after

the destruction of Jerusalem (584), Nebuchadnezzar invaded Egypt, slew its king, and again carried away a host of Jews to Babylon ; see Josephus, *Ant.* x. 9. 7 (6). Whether this is the deportation mentioned Jer. li. 30, or whether the latter refers to a remnant still existing in Judea, cannot be determined. At all events Judea lay desolate (comp. Zech. vii. 14 ; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21), so far as it was not occupied by the neighboring nations, particularly the Philistines and Edomites. The latter especially, who had long coveted the territory of Israel (Ezek. xxxv. 10), must have taken possession of the southern part of the country ; see the Greek Ezra, the so-called third book of Esdras, iv. 50 (7).

(1) Comp. my article "Gedaliah" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop*, vol. iv.

(2) Undoubtedly Gedaliah also favored Jeremiah. He was one of that party in Jerusalem who, according to the word of that prophet, regarded Zedekiah's revolt from Nebuchadnezzar as a criminal breach of faith, and considered submission to the Chaldees the only means of safety. That Nebuchadnezzar well knew those Jews who were thus minded, is shown by the friendly treatment Jeremiah experienced.

(3) That a place of worship was, as some affirm, immediately set up in Mizpah, cannot be inferred from Jer. xli. 5. By the house of the Lord there mentioned is probably rather to be understood the destroyed temple ; see Hitzig *in loc.*, and Bertheau in his work, *Zur Geschichte der Israeliten*, p. 383.

(4) The *occasion* of this conspiracy can scarcely have been that Ishmael, as Josephus thinks (*Ant.* x. 9. 3), himself aspired to the government of the Jews ; see, on the other hand, the article cited, p. 701. The reason for the deed is rather to be sought in the odium incurred by Gedaliah as the friend of the Chaldeans.

(5) According to patristic tradition, Jeremiah was stoned by his fellow-countrymen. Hated and abhorred during his life, his name was honored after his death in the legends and hopes of his people. Compare the dream of Judas Maccabæus, 2 Macc. xv. 14 sq., also Matt. xvi. 14, according to which his appearance seems to have been expected before that of the Messiah.

(6) An account, the correctness of which has been impugned, but upon insufficient grounds. [The fact of an invasion of Egypt, and perhaps even a second time, by Nebuchadnezzar is now made tolerably certain by an Egyptian and a cuneiform inscription, although the former gives the year 572, the latter 568. See Schrader, art. "Nebukadnezar" in Riehm.]

(7) Hebron seems to have been possessed by them not only in the Maccabæan times, but is even regarded by Josephus as belonging to Idumeæ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 7.

FIFTH DIVISION.

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION FROM THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY TO THE CESSATION OF PROPHECY (ABOUT 400 B.C.)

§ 188.

Condition of the People and Agency of the Prophets during the Captivity.

The *condition of the Jews in captivity* does not seem, so far as we can ascertain from the writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, to have been one of special oppression (comp. *e.g.* xxix. 5–7). The people dwelt apart, maintaining their tribal dis-

tinction, under their own elders. In the apocryphal narrative of Susannah, also, it is assumed that the Jews in Babylon formed a special community, with a jurisdiction of its own. A true Israelite could indeed know no real happiness at a distance from the Holy Land (Ps. cxxxvii.) (1). To such a one it would be a state of continued mourning "to eat defiled bread among the Gentiles;" Ezek. iv. 13, comp. with Hos. ix. 7 sq. (see § 136, 2, with note 2). But the same word of prophecy, whose truth was proved by the judgment which had fallen upon them, exhorted them to wait with patience for the hour when the deliverance of Israel should appear in the doom of Babylon. For this future deliverance was Israel to be preserved in captivity, to be treated like the unfaithful wife, who, though put away by her husband, might not be married to any other, and therefore received no bill of divorce (Isa. l. 1, comp. with Hos. iii.). In many, indeed, the propensity to idolatry was not even yet eradicated by the judgments that had overtaken them (see Ezek. xiv. 3 sqq., and still later, Isa. lxv. 3 sqq.). This made it all the more needful to keep the people in as decided a state of separation as possible from their heathen surroundings. And as the Levitical worship could not be carried on upon heathen soil (see Hos. ix. 4), and the sacrifice of prayer had now to take the place of animal sacrifices, it was important to keep all the more strictly to those legal institutions whose observance was not connected with the Holy Land. Such ordinances would form a salutary fence for the people thus thrown in contact with the heathen, and a protection against a heathen mode of life; and this consideration explains why *Ezekiel* so emphatically insisted on the observance of the ceremonial law, and especially on the sanctification of the sabbath. The example of Ezekiel, comp. xiv. 1, xx. 1, also viii. 1, xi. 25, xxiv. 19, also shows that now, when the two other theocratic offices, the kingship and priesthood, were annulled, the leadership of the people devolved exclusively on the *prophets*, who, by the proclamation of God's word and the delivery of prophetic counsel, afforded to the dispersion a point of support similar to that which they had furnished to the pious in the kingdom of the ten tribes. Perhaps it was from the custom which now arose among the Israelites, of gathering around a prophet to hear the word of God, that *synagogues* (בָּתֵּי כְנֶסֶת) originated. It was during the captivity, according to Zech. vii. 3, 5, viii. 19, that four days of *mournful commemoration*, kept by fasting, were added to the celebration of the Sabbath, viz., 1st, The ninth day of the fourth month, because on this day (2 Kings xxv. 3, Jer. lii. 6 sq.) the Chaldeans entered Jerusalem; 2d, The already-mentioned tenth of the fifth month (Jer. lii. 12) (subsequently exchanged for the ninth), in remembrance of the destruction of the city and temple; 3d, A fast in the seventh month (Tisri), in remembrance of the murder of Gedaliah (2 Kings xxv. 25, Jer. xli. 1; and also, 4th, A fast on the tenth day of the tenth month (Tebeth), because on this day (2 Kings xxv. 1, Jer. lii. 4) the siege of Jerusalem commenced.

But the prophets of God had, during the captivity, a mission to fulfil to the *heathen* also. By their transportation to a heathen land, nay, to the chief seat of heathen divination, the light of the Divine word was set up among the Gentiles themselves, and an opportunity given to their soothsayers and augurs to try their powers against the revelation of the living God. The conflict waged by Jehovah against the gods of the land, when He delivered His people out of Egypt, was renewed with increased intensity at Babylon. The Gentile world was to

learn by experience where the knowledge of the Divine counsel which guides the destinies of nations, and the foretelling of things yet future were to be found, and to judge by this standard of the real existence of its gods. To carry on this struggle was the special vocation of *Daniel*, who was educated at the Babylonian court in all the wisdom of the Chaldees, and raised to the highest honors; while the same contest is presented in the prophetic book of Isaiah, ch. xl.–lxvi. From this it is evident that the oppression of the people on the part of the Chaldean rulers must have greatly increased during the course of the captivity; see xlvii. 6, li. 13, 23 (2), comp. also xiv. 3. To this two causes may have contributed,—on the one hand, the rebellious conduct of such Jews as were not willing to wait patiently for the hour of deliverance promised by God, but resorted to remedies of their own, comp. the threat ch. l. 11; on the other, the undaunted testimony borne by the prophets against heathenism as well as against the rebellious faction among the Jews themselves, comp. *e.g.* lvii. 3 sqq. The whole prophetic delineation of the servant of God, tried and glorified by sufferings (ch. xl. sqq.), is based upon that experience of suffering in captivity by which the elect remnant of the nation was purified.

(1) Ps. cxxxvii. 4-6: "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."

(2) In Isa. xlvii. 6, Babylon is thus addressed: "Thou didst show them no mercy: even upon the ancient hast thou laid very heavily thy yoke." In li. 13 it is said to the people: "Thou hast feared continually every day because of the fury of the oppressor when he maketh ready to destroy."

§ 189.

Deliverance and Return of Jews from Babylon. Commencement of the Rebuilding of the Temple.

After *Cyrus* had ascended the Medo-Babylonian throne, he gave the Jews permission, in the first year of his reign, to return to Palestine and to rebuild their destroyed temple at Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22 sq., Ezra i. 1 sq.). He called upon the other inhabitants of places in which Israelites had settled to assist the emigrants, and to furnish them with contributions (i. 4) for their temple, he himself restoring to them the sacred vessels (i. 7 sqq.) which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away, and assigning them not only a subsidy from the royal revenues for the rebuilding of their temple, but also materials for the restored sacrificial worship (vi. 4, 8 sqq.). According to Josephus, *Antiq.* xi. 1. 2, Cyrus was induced to act thus by being shown the prophecy in Isa. xliv. 28, which Josephus holds to have been uttered 210 years previously (1). However unfounded this statement may be regarded, as it is by many, who suggest that Josephus is an uncertain authority for such matters, it cannot reasonably be denied that some such occurrence must be presupposed, to explain the remarkable edict of the heathen monarch (2). If such an Israelite as Daniel was really exercising high authority at the Babylonian court, all is easily understood. And that Cyrus should have taken account of a prophecy relating to himself will be found probable, when it is considered what interest

Nebuchadnezzar took in the prophetic agency of Jeremiah; and, to cite a later example, how Josephus managed to get into the favor of Vespasian, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 8. 9. The explanation, however, of the edict of Cyrus proposed *e.g.* by Winer (*Realwörterbuch*, 3d ed. i. p. 241), viz. that it appeared to Cyrus that the space occupied by the Jewish colony might be more advantageously employed for the restraint and chastisement of other conquered nations, or that he desired to secure a basis of operations for his projected conquest of Egypt, etc., is utterly erroneous. To assert this is entirely to overlook the fact that the permission of Cyrus, as afterward that of Darius Hystaspis, related solely to the restoration of the temple, which involved also to a certain degree that of the city of Jerusalem, but by no means extended to the building of the walls and fortifications (see Auberlen, *The Prophecies of Daniel*, p. 117). It is obvious, both from the state of the case and the further course of events, that the Persian kings showed no kind of inclination to restore Jerusalem as a fortress, in which character it had already proved so difficult to conquer, and thus afford to a nation so notorious for its tendency to revolt a firm basis of operations (3).

The *return* from Babylon took place under the conduct of *Zerubbabel*, the grandson (4) of King Jehoiachin (who, according to 2 Kings xxv. 27 sqq., died in Babylon), and therefore a scion of the house of David, and, according to Ezra i. 8, the נָשִׂיא, or hereditary prince of the tribe of Judah, who was made the Persian viceroy or פֶּחָה (Pasha) (5). With him was associated, as spiritual ruler of the people, the high priest Joshua, or, as his name is also written, Jeshua. Under the direction of these men, 42,360 Israelites, Ezra ii. 64, Neh. vii. 66, reckoned from twelve years old and upward, as we are told in the Greek Book of Ezra, v. 41, with above 7000 bondmen and bondwomen, returned to Palestine. These belonged for the most part to the tribe of *Judah*, and were accompanied by comparatively *many priests* (6) and strikingly few *Levites*. Individuals belonging to other tribes may also have been found among the band. That these returning Israelites regarded themselves as the representatives of the twelve tribes, was afterward shown by the offering of the twelve goats as a sin-offering for all Israel at the consecration of the temple, Ezra vi. 17 (7). The Jewish tradition in the Babylonian Talmud, that only the meanest and poorest returned, while the rich and noble remained at Babylon, may be relatively true, and also corresponds with the prophetic announcement, Zeph. iii. 12. Still the accounts of the contributions to the temple (Ezra ii. 68, 69; Neh. vii. 70–72) show that there were also persons of considerable wealth among those who came back. The returned Jews at first assembled for the worship of God at an altar set up for the purpose, Ezra iii. 2, and regular sacrificial service began, according to ver. 6, on the first day of the seventh month. It is possible that this circumstance may have given rise to the celebration of the first of Tisri, the new-moon Sabbath, as the first day of the civil year; and we afterward find a solemn celebration of this day by the reading of the law by Ezra, and the rejoicings connected therewith, spoken of Neh. viii. 1, 9–12 (8). Preparations were immediately made for the rebuilding of the temple (Ezra ii. 68 sq., iii. 7–9). It was a time of hearty enthusiasm, which showed itself more especially at the laying of the foundations of the temple in the second month of the following year (iii. 3–10). Perhaps the anonymous psalms of rejoicing, xcvi.–xcix., which proclaim the speedy coming of the Lord to judge

the heathen and to set up His kingdom upon earth, belong to this period. Ps. cii. 14 sq. is a testimony to the hopes then entertained (9). The newly settled nation was, however, to experience grievous trials. The *Samaritans*, whose desire to obtain a share in the new temple was rejected, revenged themselves by intriguing at the Persian court to hinder the building, which now ceased till the second year of Darius Hystaspis (Ezra iv. 1–5).

(1) In Isa. xliv. 28, the Lord says of Cyrus: "He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid."

(2) The edict Ezra i. 2 begins thus: "Jehovah, the God of heaven, hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and He hath charged me to build Him an house at Jerusalem which is in Judah." Herodotus also makes oracles play a considerable part in the history of the life of Cyrus.

(3) The act of Cyrus, according to the descriptions given in the most ancient accounts, can only be explained by the *religious* interest which he took in the Jews.

(4) By his son Pedaiah, according to 1 Chron. iii. 19, by Shealtiel according to Ezra iii. 2 [and Hagg. ii. 23], Zerubbabel being esteemed the son of the latter, either by reason of a levirate marriage, or because he had been adopted by him.

(5) He is also called Sheshbazzar, a Chaldee name, probably bestowed on him as a similar one was on Daniel. His Hebrew name Zerubbabel probably = זְרוּעַ בָּבֶל, *Babylone genitus*.

(6) This circumstance shows how greatly during the captivity, into which a portion of the priesthood had been carried so early as the deportation under Jehoiachin (§ 185; Jer. xxix. 1, Ezek. i. 3), an attachment to the religion of their fathers had been strengthened, more especially among the priests.

(7) This is also shown by the offerings of those who came up with Ezra (Ezra viii. 35). The circumstance, too, that twelve heads of houses, including Zerubbabel and Joshua, presided over the first band of travellers, might be explained on this ground. (See Neh. vii. 7, by which the list in Ezra ii. 2 must be completed, and the apocryphal 1 Esdras, v. 8.) How much was thought in the newly assembled community of being able to show a pure Israelitish descent, is obvious from Ezra ii. 59 sqq. The want of genealogical authentication in the case of priests, however, involved only a suspension of priestly privileges; and it is not said that "they who could not show their father's house and their seed whether they were of Israel," were excluded from the congregation. The colony also included, according to vi. 21, Neh. x. 29, proselytes "who had separated themselves from the filthiness of the heathen to seek the Lord God of Israel." That care was continually taken to keep the tribes distinct, is shown by the list of the people in Nehemiah's days. It records, however, those only who belonged to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, all the others being comprised under the indefinite expression שְׁאָר יִשְׂרָאֵל. The genealogies of the ten tribes may for the most part have been lost, though in the New Testament, Luke ii. 36, a woman of the tribe of Asher is spoken of.

(8) [Comp. § 150, and more particularly the art. "Feste der späteren Juden" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 2d ed., and Riehm's art. "Jahr" in his *Handwörterbuch.*]

(9) Ps. cii. is usually assigned to the latter times of the captivity: to me it seems more probably to belong to the day of small things after the return. It is said, ver. 13 sq.: "Thou shalt arise and have mercy on Zion; for the time to favor her, yea, the set time, is come. For Thy servants take pleasure in her stones," etc. The Lord had "looked down from the heights of His Sanctuary, . . . to hear the groaning of the prisoner, to loose those appointed unto death;" therefore the people might now also expect the further accomplishment of the prophetic word, the appearing of the glory of Zion, and the association of all nations in the service of the Lord (comp. vers. 20–23).

§ 190.

The Period from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspis.

Of this interval we have no account. It is true that, according to the theory formerly prevailing, and still advocated by Ewald, Köhler, and others, the section Ezra iv. 6–23 is made to refer to this period, by Ahashverosh being taken for Cambyses, and Artahhshashta for the Pseudo-Smerdis (1). But it is only by the most arbitrary assumption that the names in question can be referred to other kings than those who bear these names in other parts of the Old Testament. Hence here, as elsewhere, Ahashverosh is Xerxes, and Artahhshashta Artaxerxes; and this section, which was interpolated at the editing of the Hebrew Ezra, treats of an opposition first raised against the building of the *city* of Jerusalem and its walls under the Persian kings there named (2). In the whole period from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspis, hindrances to the *building of the temple* are only mentioned, and iv. 5 should be immediately followed by ver. 24. In the sixth month of the second year of *Darius*, 520 B.C., the prophet *Haggai* was raised up (3) to encourage the viceroy Zerubbabel by prophecy; to press upon the people, of whom indolence and dejection had taken possession, the resumption of the building of the temple; and to revive their hopes of the promised redemption (Hag. i.) (4). When, however, the meanness of the building (ii. 3, comp. with Zech. iv. 10) produced fresh despondency, the people were comforted by Haggai, and also by *Zechariah*, who was commissioned two months after him, by the consideration that the day of small things must not be despised, because success came not by might nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord (Zech. iv. 1–6, comp. Hag. ii. 5). As, in spite of all difficulties, the building of the temple would now be successfully accomplished (Zech. iv. 7–9), so also was redemption assured to them. As yet, indeed, the heathen were dwelling in proud security, and Judah was in a state of humiliation (i. 8–13); but soon that great shaking of the nations would take place, in which the heathen powers would wear each other out (Hag. ii. 6, 21, comp. with Zech. ii. 1–4). Then would the kingdom of God, into which the Gentiles should be incorporated, and to which they should dedicate all their treasures, triumph (Hag. ii. 7 sq., Zech. viii. 20–23). For the covenant people, however, a new sifting and purification was ordained (for this is the meaning of the vision v. 1–11) (5). When the building of the temple, in reliance upon Divine protection, was thus resumed, the Persian officials on this side the Euphrates at first permitted the matter to be proceeded with, until the royal decision should be ascertained. The decree of Cyrus being found among the archives at Ecbatana, the decision was favorable to the Jews. Darius commanded not only that the building of the temple should not be hindered, but also granted state assistance both for this purpose and for the regular maintenance of the sacrifices. The building consequently proceeded, and the temple was finished and dedicated in the sixth year of Darius, 516 B.C. (Ezra v. sq.)

(1) See Köhler, *die Weissagungen Haggai's*, p. 17 sqq. Kleinert, *Dorpater Beiträge zu den theol. Wissenschaften*, i. p. 5 sqq.) first pointed out the correct view, and F. W. Schultz (in his article "Cyrus der Grosse," *Stud. und Kritik*, 1835, p. 685 sqq.) and Bertheau (*Exeget. Handbuch zu Esra, Nehemia, und Esther*, p.

69 sqq.) have more particularly discussed the matter. Hengstenberg and Keil are of the same opinion.

(2) In the so-called Third Book of Ezra, the whole section stands in a different place.

(3) The part taken by the watchmen of Israel (comp. Isa. lii. 8, etc.) at the return of the people to the Holy Land is not known to us, our information concerning the ministrations of the prophets after the captivity commencing only at this epoch.

(4) We have no certain information concerning the personal circumstances of Haggai (חַגַּי, LXX Ἀγγαῖος) beyond what we are told in his writings and in Ezra v. 1, vi. 14. Perhaps he was one of the old men who had seen the former temple in its glory (Hag. ii. 3).

(5) It should be remembered that these predictions were uttered not long before the commencement of the Persian wars, which introduced that shaking of the nations in which ancient history in the course of time terminated. The authority at this time exercised by the prophets is testified not only by the resumption of the building of the temple at their word, but also by Zech. vii. 3. No other prophets are mentioned till the days of Nehemiah.

§ 191.

The Jews under Xerxes. Beginning of Ezra's Administration.

We have no information concerning the condition of the people in Palestine during the next fifty-eight years, except the short paragraph Ezra iv. 6, which, as above remarked, refers to the time of *Xerxes* (1). To fill up the gap with certain psalms, as Ewald does, who transposes Ps. lxxxix., xliv., lxxiv., lxxix., lx., lxxxv. to this period, is an uncertain hypothesis, even though these psalms may present, as will be shown, a certain adaptation to the circumstances of the times (2). Nor is there any better historical authority for relegating, with certain Fathers of the Church, as Theodoret and Theodore of Mopsuestia, the fulfilment of the predictions concerning Gog and Magog, Ezek. xxxviii., with those also of Joel iii., Mic. iv. 11, to the times of Zerubbabel, and consequently speaking of a Scythian invasion and of great conflicts between the Jews and the surrounding nations as then taking place (3). On the other hand the occurrence *in Persia* to which the Book of Esther refers, does belong to this period, viz. to the reign of Xerxes. That an historical germ cannot but be acknowledged in this book, is testified by the existence of the Feast of Purim (4). Its historical value, however, consists rather in the contribution it affords toward our knowledge of the later Judaism ; and Bertheau justly dwells upon the contrast presented by the Israel to whom, according to Isa. xl. sqq., is committed the mission of setting up the kingdom of God among the Gentiles, and the Jewish people as here depicted (5).

In the time of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, the thread of the history of the Jewish settlement in the Holy Land is again taken up, viz. first by the Book of Ezra, ch. vii., at the seventh year of this monarch (458 B.C.). We find the colony in Palestine in a state of great depression. The Jewish territory had, it is true, extended toward the south (6); but the condition of the people was an extremely sad one, by reason of the heavy burdens imposed upon them under the arbitrary sway of the Persian governors, Neh. v. 15 (7). Internal disorders also prevailed ; the ordinances of the law, which, comparatively speaking, had not as yet been revived, were neglected ; and the lukewarmness of the people was especially shown by their

contracting marriages with the heathen who dwelt in their neighborhood, and also in some instances among them. The utter wretchedness of the times may be perceived from the Book of Ecclesiastes, which was probably written at this date (8). Things took a turn for the better, when, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (not of Xerxes, as some, who follow Josephus, have supposed), the priest and scribe Ezra led a second band of Israelites into Judea. The number of those who then returned was composed, according to Ezra viii., of 1596 members of twelve houses, besides (vii. 7) priests and Levites (of the three classes). But at this time also, as appears from viii. 15, there was but little willingness on the part of the Levites to return. This strange phenomenon may be explained (see Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israels von der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels*, p. 204) by supposing either that the Levites, who, as we learn from Ezek. xliv. 9 sqq. and xlviii. 11, must in the pre-Babylonian period have been even more deeply involved in idolatry than the priests (9), united themselves during the captivity with the heathenistic party among the people ; or that the jealousy entertained by them at the preference of the Aaronic race, which, according to the Pentateuch, dated from the earliest times, was still influencing them. The royal authority committed to Ezra (vii. 11) is another proof that the interest taken in the Jews by the Persian kings was a religious one. To provide for the restoration of the legal worship was the first object ; and all the expenses needed to secure this purpose were, so far as they were not covered by voluntary contributions, to be furnished at the cost of the state. Ezra was strictly to enforce the observance of the Mosaic law as well as of the commands of the king upon all Israelites dwelling in the provinces beyond the Euphrates. Ezra began his work of reformation by the dismissal of all the heathen wives,—a measure which, as may be seen from the description of the law, § 102, was carried out to an extent considerably surpassing the prohibitions of the Mosaic law concerning mixed marriages. Of Ezra's subsequent administration during the next twelve years, nothing is narrated. What happened during this period may be inferred from the record (Ezra iv. 7–23), which, as remarked § 190, is of this date, compared with Neh. i. sq. ; for Neh. i. 3 cannot but produce an impression that occurrences then quite recent are there spoken of (10). Hence a new and heavy trial must have fallen upon the Jews, who during this time must have attempted to fortify Jerusalem, for which they had as yet no permission from the Persian kings (11). The mistrust of the Persian officials being excited by this conduct, they induced Artaxerxes to prohibit the fortification of Jerusalem, and, with the assistance of the hostile neighboring states, carried his decree into execution by destroying such portions as were already built. At this point the narrative of the Book of Nehemiah commences.

(1) This gap in the history does not occur to the Rabbins, who have never been distinguished for chronological accuracy, and who *bonâ fide* jumble together Ezra and Nehemiah with Zerubbabel and his contemporaries.

(2) See Ewald, *Hist. of the People of Israel*, v. p. 119 sqq. According to this view, Jerusalem was at this time most grievously injured and despised by the neighboring states, the temple itself damaged, and the whole country devastated.

(3) When Theodoret makes Zerubbabel also conquer the enemy and finish the

temple at Jerusalem with the spoil, it is obvious that these statements, for which he appeals to ancient authorities, are mainly derived from these very prophetic passages. No certainty can in any way be obtained but by recurring to the Book of Nehemiah, of which hereafter.

(4) For, as Winer (*Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, 3d ed. p. 351) remarks, "It is not so easy to introduce festivals among whole nations as it is for a student sitting in his study, with the modern measuring rule in his hand, to raise doubts concerning the records of antiquity." On the meaning of the name יְמֵי הַפּוּרִים, see Esth. ix. 24–26, comp. iii. 7. For further particulars, see the article "Feste der späteren Juden" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*

(5) See Bertheau, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Büchern Esra, Nehemiah, und Esther*, p. 287. The book "clearly and loudly testifies that the people to whom the conquest of the world was promised were departing further and further from communion with the living God, were trusting to their own arm and to earthly power, and consequently must succumb in the conflict with the powers of the world." The more particular features of the book are discussed in the introduction. It is remarkable that in the Hebrew text the name of God never occurs; in the LXX, on the contrary, it is once or twice met with. The canonicity of this book was disputed in Christian antiquity, and it is well known how low a position was assigned to it by Luther (*de servo arbitrio*). Compare also the article "Kanon des A. T." in Herzog, vii. pp. 251, 258.

(6) See Neh. xi. 25 sqq. According to ver. 30 of this passage, the children of Judah dwelt from Beer-sheba unto the valley of Hinnom, that is, from the southern boundary of the former Jewish state to the valley of Hinnom.

(7) Palestine must also undoubtedly have borne its share in the sacrifices exacted for the contest waged by the Persian monarchy against Greece; and the more so, since, according to Herodotus, vii. 89, a portion of the fleet of Xerxes was equipped in its ports.

(8) See Hengstenberg, *Der Prediger Salomo*, p. 12 sqq., and Kleinert, *Der Prediger Salomo, Programm des Friedr.-Wilh.-Gymn. in Berlin*, 1864, in which, p. 25 sqq., the relations of this age are excellently discussed. Hengstenberg goes somewhat too far in the manner in which he elucidates the book from Persian history; still he has contributed much apt illustration. The canonicity of Ecclesiastes was a matter of dispute so late as the end of the first century after Christ, when it was first firmly established; comp. the article *Kanon des A. T.* p. 251 sq. The book is not quoted in the New Testament. [Böhl, however, holds, *Die A. T. Citate im N. T.*, 1878, p. 161, that in Rom. iii. 10 there is a reference to the Septuagint version of Ecclesiastes vii. 20.]

(9) A confusion of the priestly and Levitical offices must at this time have also taken place; at least, unless this is assumed, the passages Ezek. xliv. 9 sqq., xlviii. 11, can hardly be satisfactorily explained. For after Ezekiel had already, xl. 46, xliii. 19, explicitly stated that among the Levites only the descendants of Zadok might approach the Lord in priestly service, the passages quoted announce to the Levites, as a punishment for their apostasy to idolatry, that in the new temple they are to be utterly excluded from all priestly functions, and only employed in the performance of humbler offices. [How Wellhausen, with whom Smend in his *Commentar zu Ezekiel* agrees, explains these passages, see § 93, note 6.]

(10) See the discussion of this matter in Bertheau, *id.* p. 130 sqq. Keil also regards Neh. i. 3 as referring to the Chaldee destruction. But let us look at the case. Jews arrive at Susa from Jerusalem. Nehemiah inquires how things are going on there, and they begin to complain. And their complaint would run somewhat like this: The walls of Jerusalem (which were destroyed 140 years ago) are not yet rebuilt, and the gates still lie there burned up. We are indebted to Bertheau, with whom I entirely agree, *id.*, for having first placed this in its true light, and thus assigned the paragraph Ezra iv. 7 sqq. to its right place.

(11) An attempt which is easily to be explained by the efforts excited among the people by Ezra to keep up a strict separation between themselves and their heathen neighbors, on the ground of the Mosaic institutions, and one, moreover,

which, considering the friendly disposition, shown by the Persian monarch in the mission of Ezra, was likely to be attended with success.

§ 192.

Ezra and Nehemiah. The Close of Prophecy.

Nehemiah, who was sent to Jerusalem by Artaxerxes in the 20th year of that monarch's reign (B.C. 445), with the authority of governor, effected the restoration of the walls and gates of Jerusalem (ch. iii. sq.), notwithstanding the opposition he encountered from individuals hostile to the Jews (Neh. ii. 10, 19), and who, as we learn from vi. 17 sq., xiii. 4, 28, had adherents even among the chief men in the city. He next set heartily to work at the removal of internal sores. He had to deal with a needy proletariat, which had suffered much ill-usage at the hand of wealthy usurers, and was much exasperated against its opulent oppressors (v. 2, 5) (1). Nehemiah put a stop to usury, effected a restoration of mortgaged estates (vers. 6–13), and took vigorous measures for the maintenance of security and order (ch. vii.). *Ezra* also now began to act in his capacity of a teacher of the law (ch. viii.). On a day of general fasting, the people were bound by oath to the observance of the law, for which purpose a document was drawn up and signed by Nehemiah, the heads of the priests, the Levites (2), and the rest of the people (ch. ix. 1) (3). Ezra, as being the imposer of the obligation upon the people, was not himself among those who signed. He occupied a position similar to that of Moses when the people first bound themselves to the covenant (Ex. xxiv.); and yet *how utterly were circumstances now changed!* Then, a mediator of the covenant, commissioned immediately by Jehovah, and authenticated as such by great acts of Divine revelation; now, a man who had received his authority from a heathen king, for Ezra does not claim to be an organ of revelation. Then, a people redeemed from heathen bondage, and assured of the effectual indwelling of its God; now, a scanty remnant, obliged to confess, Neh. ix. 36 sq., "Behold, we are servants this day; and the land that Thou gavest our fathers to eat the fruit thereof, behold, we are servants in it: and it yielded much increase to the kings whom Thou hast set over us because of our sins." The written law had taken the place of the shekhina of the God-King, whose pledges (the ark and the Urim and Thummim) were lacking to the new community, and the people now testify their reverence for the roll of the Law (viii. 5). To Ezra must be attributed not a *re-foundation of the theocracy*, but only a *restoration of the ordinances of the law*, which was now fenced about by further restrictions—the סיג התורה—to guard against the infraction of the commandments. An example of this is found in the injunction beyond the limits of the Mosaic law, on the part of Ezra and Nehemiah, with regard to the mixed marriages,—a measure the severity of which was justified by a reference to the warning derived from the example of Solomon, xiii. 26 (4). Ezra was the *founder of Judaism proper;* and in this very fact lies his great *importance in the history also of the kingdom of God.* For, the restoration, through his instrumentality, of those ordinances which formed the wall of partition that separated the people from the Gentiles, was the means of preserving the unity of the nation, to which not only the preservation of the λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. iii. 2, was committed till their fulfilment, but from which also was to arise

that λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, xi. 5, which formed the stock of the new church of the redeemed (5).

After a twelve years' sojourn in Palestine (433 B.C.), Nehemiah returned to Persia. But new abuses sprang up during his absence, and he returned for the second time,—when, cannot be certainly determined; but as הַמֶּלֶךְ in Neh. xiii. 6 most naturally refers to Artaxerxes, it was probably before the death of that monarch, *i.e.* before 424 B.C., though, according to another view, not till the reign of Darius Nothus. Energetic measures were then taken to restore order; and Nehemiah even cast out the grandson of Eliashib the high priest, because he had married a daughter of Sanballat, who was probably a Samaritan, and, according to Josephus, the Persian satrap of Samaria (6). This expelled priest is undoubtedly the same individual with Manasseh, of whom Josephus speaks, *Ant.* xi. 8, as the founder of the Samaritan temple upon Mount Gerizim, though he erroneously refers this matter to the times of Darius Codomannus (whom he confounds with Darius Nothus) and Alexander the Great (7). The Samaritans were now strengthened by the accession of many other discontented Jews who had contracted mixed marriages, and of such as were, according to Josephus, accused of a breach of the laws concerning food and the keeping of the Sabbath; at all events, a certain intermingling of the Jewish and Samaritan races took place at this time. The Mosaic law was now adopted by the Samaritans, who on that very account became all the more the rivals of the Jews, and were consequently the more detested by them; comp. *e.g.* the passage, Wisd. l. 25 sq. (27 sq.) (8). Prophecy was in Nehemiah's days in a state of deep declension. When Nehemiah was accused by Sanballat of having appointed prophets to proclaim him king, he retorted by accusing Sanballat of having hired the prophet Shemaiah to put him in fear, on which occasion other prophets and a prophetess Noadiah are also mentioned (Neh. vi. 6–14). In his days, however, that is, in the time of his second governorship, the last of the canonical prophets of the Old Testament exercised his ministry. His book, the last of the minor prophets, is known as that of מַלְאָכִי, a name which should perhaps be understood appellatively. [Although more probably it is the name of the prophet Malachi.—D.] From the Book of Malachi we learn that an external legalism, which subsequently developed into Pharisaism, had now taken possession of the masses. Malachi contends against a dead self-righteousness, which was contented with the most superficial fulfilment of the law (Mal. i. 6 sqq., iii. 7 sqq.), and announces to the people who, discontented with the uneventful course of the day of small things, were desiring the judgments of God upon the heathen world and the appearance of the times of deliverance (ii. 17, iii. 13 sqq.), that the days of Messianic redemption would certainly appear, but would be preceded by a heavy and sifting judgment of the covenant people themselves (iii. 1 sqq., 19, 23 sq., iv. 1, 5 sq.) (9). With the promise of the Divine messenger, who was, in the power of Elijah, to prepare the way for the Lord who was coming to His temple (iii. 1, 23), the prophecies of the Old Testament conclude (10). For even the times of the Maccabees, when a prophet was expected, were unable, in spite of the heroic enthusiasm then displayed, to produce one (comp. such passages as 1 Macc. iv. 46, ix. 27, xiv. 41). If in later days the gift of prophecy was claimed, as Josephus tells us, for individuals, viz. for Hyrcanus, *Ant.* xiii. 10. 7, for seers among the Essenes, xiii. 11. 2, and

xv. 10. 5, nay, for himself, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 8. 9, this is of no importance so far as the history of Prophetism is concerned. On the other hand, prophecy shone forth once more in the appearance of that messenger announced by Malachi, whom Christ declared, Matt. xi. 11, the greatest yet born of woman, and who closed the times of the old covenant by pointing to the already risen sun of righteousness in the words, John iii. 30, "He must increase, but I must decrease" (11).

(1) Neh. v. 2: "We, our sons, and our daughters, are many: therefore we take up corn for them, that we may eat and live." Ver. 5: "Our flesh is as the flesh of our brethren, our children as their children; and, lo, we bring into bondage our sons and our daughters to be servants, . . .: neither is it in our power to redeem them, for other men have our lands and vineyards."

(2) The post-Babylonian *priests* dwelt for the most part at Jerusalem. It seems, from Ezra ii. 70 and Neh. vii. 73, xi. 3, that the old cities of the priests were also sought out. The old cities of the Levites are not mentioned. Neh. x. 35 sqq. shows that the revenues of the priests were under Nehemiah established according to the law, and xii. 44 that the offices required for their administration were also appointed.

(3) The repeated formal engagements undertaken upon oath by the people in honor of Jehovah, are among the peculiarities of Israelitish history. The first transaction of the kind took place under Moses, another after the overthrow of Athaliah, another under Josiah, and one such is here related.

(4) [The critics of the Reuss and Graf school hold a different view. According to them, the most important ordinances are of post-exilic origin, and especially the priests' codex is a work of Ezra, but in the sense that it is a collection made by him, of existing legal enactments. Comp. Wellhausen, i. 420 sqq., Reuss, § 378 sqq. But while according to the former of these writers Ezra brought the law from Babylon, and then waited fourteen years "until he finally (in the year 444) came out with the law which he had brought with him," the latter assures us that this was not possible: "If . . . the law was read for the first time in the presence of Nehemiah, this did not occur till fourteen years after the arrival of Ezra, and consequently it is proved that it was not previously known in Jerusalem, and therefore that Ezra had not brought it all ready from Babylon, and that he took many years to bring it into the form which he may have given it" (§ 377). Because Reuss is not acquainted with the reasons which led Ezra not to read the law till the fourteenth year, or perhaps because it did not occur to Ezra to do it till that time, it is "proved" that the law was not previously in existence! The conclusion of Wellhausen that Ezra was the author of the law is no better: "Most important is the declaration (Ezra vii. 14, comp. 25) that the law of his God was *in his hand:* it was *therefore* his private property, although it claims to concern all Israel (i. p. 422). Comp. also Strack, art. "Kanon der A.T." in Herzog. The assertion made with great confidence that the priests' codex was Ezra's private property, and that in Nehemiah, chap. viii–x. "the introduction of the Pentateuch" is related, stands in irreconcilable opposition to the obvious meaning of the very portion of the book appealed to as evidence. It deserves to be mentioned also that although Wellhausen declares: "That the law of Ezra was the entire Pentateuch *admits of no doubt,*" Reuss holds that Ezra at that time only bound the people to observe the priests' codex, which was not yet united with the Jehovistic-Deuteronomic portions; that the formation of the laws of the Pentateuch was continued beyond the time of Ezra; and that accordingly the Pentateuch was not completed till the generations afterward. See on the question, Strack in Zöckler, i. p. 138 sq.]

(5) In fact matters had gone so far, that the continuance of an Israelitish nationality, maintaining its contrast to heathenism, was seriously imperilled, the strong party among the Jews which was hostile to Nehemiah being apparently determined to obliterate this contrast.

(6) Hence (see Neh. xiii. 28 sq.), and from Ezra x. 18–22, it is evident that the priests especially were subjected to the severe discipline exercised by Ezra and Nehemiah with respect to mixed marriages. Such discipline was the more needful in proportion as the needy condition of the colony affected the state of public worship, and begot indifference and discouragement among the priesthood; see Mal. i. 6, ii. 9.

(7) That is certainly the most improbable view which makes the same thing take place twice, as is done by Petermann (article "Samaria" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xiii. p. 367), who, regarding the accounts of Nehemiah and Josephus as relating to different persons, accepts two Sanballats and two sons-in-law to Jewish high priests.

(8) Ecclesiasticus, l. 25 sq.: "There be two manner of nations which my soul abhorreth, and the third is no nation; they that sit upon the mountain of Seir [the Edomites], and that dwell among the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwell at Sichem." The third is the people dwelling at Sichem, *i.e.* the Samaritans.

(9) The lecture-like form of Malachi reminds us, in the manner and way in which it lays down propositions, raises questions in opposition, and then fully answers them, of the dialogistic method of the schools, as Ewald has aptly remarked.

(10) *Jewish apocalyptic literature* is an after-growth of prophecy. It bears the character of a secret literature, and undoubtedly originated in those narrower circles (probably among the Essenes, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 12) in which the hopes of Israel were kept alive during the times in which there were no prophets, by the study of the prophetic word. In such circles the predictions of Daniel, which, Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4, decidedly refer to secret tradition, would also be disseminated, while this book, on the other hand, seems not to have been made public till the times of the Maccabees, and then to have received its final form. (The origin of these predictions in general cannot, however, be comprehended by referring them to the time of the Maccabees; comp. the article "Kanon" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* vii. p. 420.) This apocalyptic literature, whose monuments are the Book of Enoch, the Jewish Sibyllines, the Fourth Book of Ezra, the Psalter of Solomon, aims at constructing a course of history in the light of the prophetic word, in which attempt it fastens especially on symbolic numbers. Such apocalyptic literature is, however, the product of reflection; and no prophet, properly so called, is known by Judaism after Malachi; comp. on this subject the article "Messias" in Herzog, ix. p. 426 sqq. [also Schürer, *N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 511 sqq.]

(11) It is a remarkable phenomenon, that as, before the Chaldean destruction of Jerusalem, false prophecy was at its height, and bore a great share of the guilt of that terrible catastrophe, so, also, in the dreadful days preceding the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, a number of false prophets again appeared, by whose worthless predictions the people were involved in ruin (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 2 sq.), while the genuine word of prophecy was despised.

§ 193.

The Beginning of Sopherism. Public Worship at the Close of this Period.

Since, in a time in which no revelation from on high is received, men are referred to the written revelation, and above all to the written law, the *scribes* or *Sopherim*, who diligently applied themselves to the records of revelation, and especially to the exposition, completion, and fencing of the law, now appear in the place of the prophets. Their prototype and representative is Ezra (comp. Ezra vii. 6, 10), for which reason subsequent tradition refers to him whatever the united agency of the scribes effected (1). The Sopherim originally

sprang from the priesthood, the scribe Ezra being also a priest. The exposition of the law was indeed a part of the priestly office (see Mal. ii. 7, comp. § 95), and in Hag. ii. 11 sqq. it is the priests who are referred to for a decision in questions concerning the law. It is possible that in pre-Babylonian times individual priests, specially skilled in the law, exercised this branch of their calling, and were styled the תֻּפְשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה, Jer. ii. 8, and also סֹפְרִים, viii. 8. But it was not till after the time of Ezra that the scribes (the *γραμματεῖς* of the New Testament) formed a separate class, which, though both priests and Levites belonged to it, was by no means restricted to men of Levitical descent (2). Thus an essential portion of the priestly office was lost, and indeed that portion in which was henceforth concentrated the spiritual agency and religious interest of Judaism. The priests, as such, were now restricted to the performance of religious rites and the transactions therewith connected. Now, however, the worship upon Mount Zion, of which the son of Sirach speaks so enthusiastically, l. 5–23, was without its former pledges of God's abiding presence in the midst of His people, and the temple had but an empty Holy of Holies. The prediction Jer. iii. 16 sq. was fulfilled as to its negative side, "They shall no more make the ark of the covenant," though not as to its positive side, "They shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord, and all nations shall be gathered unto it," etc. The breastplate also of the high priest was without the Urim and Thummim, whose restoration was waited for, Ezra ii. 63, § 97, but in vain. Thus, the ancient insignia with which the priesthood had been divinely furnished for its office having disappeared, the priests lost their consciousness of their mediatorial position between God and the people. They formed only a hierarchical class, which, being no longer restrained by the presence of the two other theocratic offices, was so much the more inclined to traffic with its prerogatives in the furtherance of secular and political aims (3). By the side of those services of the temple which were connected with the priesthood, was more and more developed the service of the *synagogue*, with the reading and exposition of the law,—a service whose administration devolved upon the scribes. This now formed the actual centre of the religious life of Judaism. By means of the synagogues, a different view of religious worship in general was formed, animal sacrifices declined, and their place was occupied by the sacrifice of prayer, the contemplation of the Divine word forming the central point of the service. It was chiefly with the synagogue and not with the temple, that Christian worship was connected (4).

(1) Further particulars, especially concerning the Great Synagogue, belong to the Introduction to the Old Testament. We can here give only the following:— Ezra must have taken the precaution of instructing for his purposes a number of individuals learned in the law (comp. Ezra vii. 25, Neh. viii. 7 sq., 13). Tradition assigns to him a college of scribes, under the name of *the Great Synagogue*, as sharers in his work of organization. The historical books of the Old Testament know nothing of such an authority, for it can be found neither in the committee of elders appointed, according to Ezra x. 16, for the putting away of the foreign wives, nor in that appointed, Neh. x. 1 sqq., to seal the covenant of the people to keep the law. The historical germ of this tradition probably amounts to no more than this, that in it is embodied the remembrance of the succession and co-operation of the scribes, from the times of Ezra to those of Simon the Just (about 300 B.C.). [For the latter was, according to Pirke Aboth i. 2, one of the last members.]

Whether these scribes, however, exercised their functions as an organized court, or only as a voluntary association, and in virtue of their personal authority, cannot be determined. Comp. the article "Kanon" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* vii. p. 245 sqq.

(2) It is disputed whether any scribe of the date of Ezra is known to us even by name besides himself. This depends upon how we understand Neh. xiii. 13. Zadok the scribe, who may, however, be also regarded (so Bertheau) as merely a writer who had to make the catalogue for the store-chambers of the temple, is there distinguished from both priests and Levites; if, however, he was the individual mentioned iii. 29, he must have been a priest.

(3) Comp. on this subject Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. p. 148. For further particulars on the high-priesthood, priesthood, and Levites, see the articles on these subjects in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*

(4) On the further history of Judaism. see the articles "Volk Gottes" and "Israel" in Herzog.

SECOND SECTION.

THE THEOLOGY OF PROPHETISM.

§ 194.

Summary.

The theology of Mosaism is further developed by prophecy, especially in the following respects :—

1. With regard to the doctrine of *God and of his relation to the world*, the idea of Jehovah develops into the Divine name of THE LORD OF HOSTS (*Jehovah Sabaoth*), with which is connected a further expansion of *angelology*.

2. In its conflict both with the legal externalism and the apostasy of the people, the intrinsically *moral* nature of the Law is further developed by Prophecy, and greater depth thus given to that view of *man's religious and moral relation* to God which Mosaism involves ; in other words, the doctrine of *sin and of righteousness* is further unfolded.

3. *The communion of man with God* culminates in Prophecy. *The nature of prophetic revelation and of prophecy* will be here represented as the continuation of what Mosaism teaches concerning the *forms of Divine revelation*.

4. The progress of *the kingdom of God* forms the essential matter of prophecy.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD OF HOSTS (1) AND OF ANGELS.

§ 195.

Form and Occurrence of the Name of God. Partial Views concerning its Original Meaning.

JEHOVAH SABAOTH [Heb. Tsebhaoth].—The full expression of this name of God is יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת (or יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַצְּבָאוֹת) ; it is, however, mostly found in its abbreviated form, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת (once, Amos ix. 5, יְהוָה הַצְּבָאוֹת). In the latter mode of expression, יְהוָה is not in the *status constructus* (2), against which is the form אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת occurring in certain passages in the Psalms (3) ; but the abbreviated form must be explained by an ellipsis, the more general notion being taken from the *nomen proprium*, as in נֵת פְּלֶשֶׁתִּים and similar combinations (4). צְבָאוֹת never appears alone as a name of God in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. The LXX are the first to treat the word occasionally as a *proper*

name, viz. by generally rendering it in the First Book of Samuel and in Isaiah by σαβαώθ (5); while, on the other hand, they render it in the Second Book of Samuel, frequently in Jeremiah and throughout the Minor Prophets, with the exception of Zech. xiii. 2, by παντοκράτωρ, and in the Psalms, occasionally in Jeremiah, and in some passages in other books, by κύριος or θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων (6). Jehovah Sabaoth does not occur as the Divine name in the Pentateuch, Joshua, or Judges. *It is first mentioned in the narrative of the times of Eli.* Sacrifices are offered in Shiloh to Jehovah Sabaoth (1 Sam. i. 3, comp. with iv. 4); and it is by this name that Hannah invokes God (i. 11). The name seems to have been especially in use in the days of Samuel and David (comp. 1 Sam. xv. 2, xvii. 45; 2 Sam. vii. 8, 26 sq.; Ps. xxiv. 10). In the Books of the Kings it seldom occurs, and only in the mouths of the prophets Elijah and Elisha. In the prophetical books it is most *frequently found* in Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi (7).

This name, according to its original meaning, is said by many (8) to designate Jehovah as the *God of battles of His people*, who are called, Ex. vii. 4 and xii. 41, the "armies" or "hosts" of the Lord. The expression "God of armies, or hosts" would thus be equivalent to the appellation in 1 Sam. xvii. 45 (Keri) אֱלֹהֵי מַעַרְכוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל (God of the armies of Israel). Ps. xxiv. is also referred to, where יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in ver. 10 is said to be equivalent to יְהוָה גִּבּוֹר מִלְחָמָה in ver. 8. But though it is true, as will be shortly seen, that there is in this name a *reference* to the fact that God manifests Himself in irresistible power against the enemies of His people, yet if this were its *original meaning*, it is strange that the name did not make its appearance in *those ancient times which were expressly the times of the great theocratic conflicts* ("the wars of Jehovah," Num. xxi. 14); and again, that it did not originate, but was *already in use*, in the warlike age of David. The combination in 1 Sam. xvii. 45, of "the Lord of Hosts" and "the God of the armies of Israel," testifies that the two names do not signify the same thing. A higher notion must be involved in the former, namely this, that the fact that the God of the armies of Israel *is also* the Lord of Hosts makes Him so terrible a God. A similar relation exists in Ps. xxiv. between vers. 8 and 10. From the Lord "mighty in battle," the psalm *rises* to the God of Hosts; the thought in the tenth verse corresponding with that in the first: so that the ode, in its opening and conclusion, celebrates the God of Israel as *God of the world.*—This more general meaning of the name has given currency to *a second view*, which, appealing to Gen. ii. 1, understands the expression צְבָאוֹת as applying to the *creatures in general*, who together compose the great army of the Lord. (So that it is the majesty of God in general, as displayed in his dominion over the whole creation, which this name expresses) (9). But the expression "host" is only *figuratively* applied to the creatures in general; the mention of the heavens being, in the passage appealed to, the immediate occasion of the introduction of צְבָאָם, which is applied to the creatures of the earth only in virtue of a zeugma, as the more exact expression Neh. ix. 6 shows (10). The true *explanation* of the name must be derived from the phrase *host of heaven* (צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם).

(1) Compare my article "Zebaoth" in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* xviii. p. 400 sqq. [and Baudissen, i. p. 118 sqq., on this and the following sections].

(2) So Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache*, § 268 *c*; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, iii.

p. 1146. [In his *Lehre* von Gott, ii. p. 340, Ewald explains the phrase as an abbreviation of "Jehovah, the God of the armies of heaven."]

(3) See Ps. lix. 5, lxxx. 4, 7, 14, 19, lxxxiv. 8. The Masorites, too, in the passages where יְהוִה precedes אֲדֹנָי, have never placed under the latter word the points of אֱלֹהִי, but always those of אֱלֹהִים (comp. also Isa. x. 16, אֲדֹנָי צְבָאוֹת).

(4) See Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Test.* i. p. 375 sq.

(5) Also Jas. v. 4, "the Lord of Hosts." The expression *σαβαώθ* is, however, never found alone in the LXX; it first stands thus in the *Sibyllines*, i. 304, and elsewhere. Lydus, *de mensibus*, § 38, 98, regards the name as a Phœnician one, and derives from it the number seven: *ὁ ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἑπτὰ πόλους, τοῦτ' ἐστιν ὁ δημιουργός.*

(6) The other Greek versions have the more exact expression *κύριος στρατιῶν.*

(7) It is found in other prophets also, at least in single passages, but never in either Ezekiel or Daniel. It is also wanting in the books of the Hhokhma; while, on the other hand, it sometimes appears in the Psalms, but only in the first three books, and consequently seems to have been out of use in the later psalmody. Among the post-Babylonian historical books, it is found only in Chronicles, and there only in the history of David (1 Chron. xi. 9, xvii. 7, 24).

(8) So Herder, *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry;* v. Cölln, *Theol. des A. T.* p. 104. ("This combination of the name of God is first found in the Books of Samuel, where it is pretty frequently used, but always with reference to war, battles, and victories; so that the word *hosts* must be taken as the hosts of the Israelites, and this name of God be understood to designate Him as the God of warlike hosts, the God who presides over the hosts of Israel and leads them to victory.") [So also Schultz, p. 492 sq., who argues with Schrader that the plural צְבָאוֹת is used only of earthly warriors. But this plural seldom occurs except in connection with יהוה, and the plural צְבָאִים is used of the host of angels in Ps. ciii. 21.]

(9) So Hävernick, *Theol. des A. T.* p. 48. This view is undoubtedly correct, in recognizing the fact that the almighty power of God over the universe is implied in the name, but this is not the idea which originally gave rise to it. Joh. Buxtorf (the son), also, in his treatise "de nominibus Dei hebraicis" (*Dissertat. philol. theol.* p. 280), understands by the hosts of God *varios exercitus, qui ipsi parent, ministrant et militant*, the celestial hosts, viz. the angels and stars; the terrestrial, the powers of nature, sword, famine, pestilence, etc.; and lastly, the hosts of Israel.

(10) Neh. ix. 6: "Thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and Thou preservest them all; and the *host of heaven* worshippeth Thee."

§ 196.

The Host of Heaven: 1. *The Heavenly Bodies.*

The *host of heaven* in the Old Testament includes, as the above-cited passage of Nehemiah shows, the *heavenly bodies* and the *celestial spirits.*

In the view of the nations bordering upon Israel, the heavenly bodies were either Divine powers, genii pursuing their paths clothed in ethereal bodies, or at least forms of manifestation of Divine beings. In opposition to such notions, which essentially unite if they do not identify the heavenly bodies and heavenly spirits, the Old Testament distinctly maintains not only the *creaturehood* of the heavenly host (Ps. xxxiii. 6), but also the distinction of the two above-named classes. It is only by a *poetical personification* that the stars are spoken of in the song of Deborah, Judg. v. 20, as the warriors of the Lord, who, *leaving their courses*, descend to fight for Israel against Sisera and that the morning stars are said in Job xxxviii. 7 to

have joined with the angels in celebrating the morning of creation, just as in ix. 13, xxvi. 13 (according to the most probable interpretation of these passages), a poetical application is made of mythological notions of a restraining of sidereal powers (1). The greater the danger to the Israelites, surrounded as they were by Sabæanism, of being seduced into a worship of the heavenly bodies,—(how the seductiveness of the sight of the sun and moon is depicted in Job. xxxi. 26) (2),—the more important was it not only to declare Jehovah's superiority to the heavenly bodies, and to forbid their adoration, Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3, but also to maintain such a view concerning them as might of itself exclude all worship of them. This is done from Gen. i. 14 onward. The heavenly bodies are declared to be merely *light-bearers* (מְאֹרֹת), created by God, and as such subserving earthly purposes (comp. Ps. civ. 19 sqq.). They manifest, indeed, by their splendor and their course, the greatness and wisdom of the Creator (Ps. viii. 4, xix. 5, Amos v. 8, Job ix. 9, xxxviii. 31 sq.), but their brilliancy admits of no comparison with the Divine glory, xxv. 5. Thus they are the hosts of God whom his almighty will commands (Isa. xl. 26 (3), xlv. 12) ; they serve to proclaim and to glorify His judgments (Joel iii. 15, Isa. xiii. 10, Hab. iii. 11 ; comp. the poetical passage, Josh. x. 12 sq.). Their creaturehood is shown by the fact that they as well as the terrestrial creation are transitory (Isa. xxxiv. 4, comp. with li. 6, Ps. cii. 26 sq.).—How, now, the supereminence of God above the heavenly bodies, in opposition to the worship of them, is expressed by the name Jehovah Sabaoth, is shown in Isa. xxiv. 23. This passage is not to be understood as simply parallel with lx. 19, but as also involving the thought that the last judgment, by means of which the Lord will set up His kingdom upon earth, will manifest the vanity of heathenism with its worship of the heavenly bodies and the honor it has rendered to them as the tutelary powers of kingdoms. It is possible that this element in the idea of the Jehovah Sabaoth was the original one in point of time (so Vatke), and consequently that the name may have come into use in the time of the Judges, chiefly as a counterpoise to the worship of the host of heaven. But it is more natural to seek the root of the name in the designation of the angel of the Lord as the "Captain of the host," Josh. v. 14 sq., the *chief* significance of the appellation being certainly contained in its reference to the host of the heavenly *spirits*.

(1) That the stars are not represented as persons in the passages cited, is evident from the whole teaching of the Old Testament [although Baudissen, i. 120, sees in it more than mere personification, and thinks that in the popular conception at least the stars were regarded as beings similar to the angels. Delitzsch also (art. "Engel" in Riehm) supposes that in the phrase "Host of heaven" the idea of the stars was sometimes mingled with that of the angels, and speaks of an identifying view of the angels and stars. Against this theory, see Kübel, art. "Engel" in Herzog].

(2) Job xxxi. 26 sq. : "If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness ; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand."

(3) Isa. xl. 26 describes how God each night calls forth and musters His starry host.

§ 197.

2. *The Host of the Heavenly Spirits.*

The Old Testament speaks of the *host of heavenly spirits*, the armies of the Sons of God, the angels, in a *threefold aspect* (1). *First*, they form the *higher church* which, standing at the head of the choir of the universe (Ps. cxlviii. 2, cl. 1), adores God in the *heavenly sanctuary*. It has already been remarked, when treating of the doctrine of the Shekhina (§ 62), that the indwelling of God in the earthly sanctuary corresponds with the presence of God in the heavenly sanctuary, which, like the former, bears the name of הֵיכָל (used for the first time in the Davidic Psalms), Ps. xi. 4 (2). From this central point of the Divine glory, proceed all God's manifestations of grace and judgment to the world (Mic. i. 2 sq., Hab. ii. 20, Zech. ii. 17 (A.V. 13); hence the prayer, Isa. lxiii. 15) (3). This is the sphere of the adoring higher church (4) of the sons of God, בְּנֵי אֵלִים; comp. Ps. xxix. 1, 9 (5), but especially lxxxix. 6–8, where the sons of God are called the congregation of the saints, קְהַל קְדֹשִׁים, who are constantly praising the wonders of Divine grace, with special reference in this passage to His gracious counsel in the choice of the house of David. Their near relation to God is shown ver. 7, where they are designated as סוֹד קְדֹשִׁים (the council of the saints). When, then, it is said in this passage v. 7 sq., "God is greatly to be feared in the council of His saints, and to be had in reverence of all them that are about Him; O Lord God of *Hosts*, who is like unto Thee?" the reference of this name of God to the angelic host is unmistakable. The heavenly hosts do not appear as literally an assembly of heavenly councillors—a divan, as some have represented the matter—either here or in the vision of the heavenly assize, Dan. vii. 9 sqq. (6). The meaning of this passage is rather, that the heavenly hosts, as the appointed instruments of executing God's judgments, are also to be the *witnesses* of His counsels (7). So, too, the heavenly host appear, 1 Kings xxii. 19 sqq., Job i. sq., assembled around the Lord, not that He may take counsel with them, but that they may announce to Him their execution of His behests (comp. Zech. i. 8 sqq. concerning the celestial horsemen who walk to and fro through the earth), and receive His further commands.

Secondly—and this is the point of view in which the heavenly host is chiefly represented—they are the *messengers of God* (מַלְאָכִים), the instruments of executing His will in grace and in judgment for the deliverance of His people and the subjugation of His enemies; see Ps. ciii. 20 sq., cxlviii. 2. This implies that God's government is carried on by the means of personal and living powers. Divine providence is, generally speaking, a living activity, everywhere present, seeing and knowing all things (7); hence it is symbolically designated, Zech. iv. 10 (comp. Ps. cxxxix. 7), as the seven eyes of God which run to and fro throughout the whole earth. All the powers and elements of nature subserve this providence, as it is expressed (according to the probable construction) in Ps. civ. 4: "He makes the winds His messengers, the flames of fire His servants" (comp. § 61, note 4). But for the purposes of His kingdom and for the special service of His people, He has chosen the heavenly spirits, who are the companions of man; comp. as chief passages, *e.g.* xci. 11, xxxiv. (8). But here,

too, the heavenly host is represented as a Divine *army;* in Gen. xxxii. 2, a camp of God (מַחֲנֵה) being spoken of as surrounding and protecting Jacob, with which comp. 2 Kings vi. 16, Josh. v. 14 sq. Still further with regard to *the employment of the heavenly host as the messengers of God*, the following passages should be observed: in Zech. iii. 7, it is said to Joshua the high priest, that God will give him leaders from among the angels that stand before him; comp. also Job v. 1. Especially important also is the passage in the speech of Elihu, xxxiii. 23. We do not quote this passage, as many do, in support of the doctrine of angels of a higher rank. The מַלְאָךְ מְלִיץ, *angelus interpres*, אֶחָד מִנִּי־אֶלֶף is not the angel of unparalleled dignity raised above a thousand others,—the angel of the covenant (as many, including Schlottman and Delitzsch, understand),—but an angel out of the thousand, *i.e.* such an one as God has a thousand of, מְלִיץ here signifying not his representation of man before God, but that he is the interpreter of God's will to man. He is sent by God to show to fallen man his uprightness [or duty], *i.e.* to lead him to repentance and sincere confession of sin, that so he may, according to ver. 24, find favor with God. In opposition to Satan, whose occupation it is to ruin men, Job i., God has thousands of angels whose business it is to be active in the deliverance of human souls.

Thirdly, the hosts of heavenly spirits are also appointed to be *His attendant witnesses*, and *partially His instruments when He appears in His royal and judicial glory*. This is already alluded to, Deut. xxxiii. 2, the sense of the passage naturally being, not that the angelic host remained in heaven, but that they were witnesses of those revelations in which they themselves took an active part, the Lord appearing as lawgiver in the midst of His heavenly host. Comp. Ps. lxviii. 17, where God is represented as seated upon His throne on Zion, surrounded by the chariots or cavalry of the angelic hosts. The expression רֶכֶב אֱלֹהִים, here used, places the latter in the light of a heavenly band of warriors whom God is leading to battle against His enemies, and for the protection of His people. The connection of the name Jehovah Zebaoth with this notion is shown especially by Isa. xxxi. 4 (9); and hence it is plain in what sense this name is to be regarded as designating Jehovah as the God of battles. *Lastly*, the heavenly host form Jehovah's retinue at the *final revelation of His judgment*. The heavenly hosts are the heroes whom, according to Joel iii. 11, He leads down into the valley of Jehoshaphat; they are the saints with whom, according to Zech. xiv. 5, He appears upon the Mount of Olives in the decisive hour of the last conflict of the covenant people. Compare the description of the procession of the heavenly στρατεύματα, Rev. xix. 14.

(1) The two last expressions have already been discussed in § 61.

(2) Ps. xi. 4: "The Lord is in His holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven."

(3) Mic. i. 2: "The Lord from His holy temple; ... the Lord cometh forth out of His place." Hab. ii. 20: "The Lord is in His holy temple: let all the world keep silence before Him." Zech. ii. 13: "Be silent, O all flesh, before the Lord: for He riseth up out of His holy habitation." Isa. lxiii. 15: "Look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation of Thy holiness and Thy glory."

(4) What was said Isa. vi. of the adoring seraphim, on which see § 199, belongs here.

(5) Ps. xxix. 1: The angels are called *sons of God* (comp. § 61, note 2), who

give to the Lord glory and strength ; it is of them that it is said, ver. 5, that while the voice of the Lord goes forth in the storm over the whole earth, "in His temple all speak of His honor." (Luther's transl., "all speak, Honor !")

(6) Dan. iv. 17, indeed, differs in this respect. But here Nebuchadnezzar, when he speaks of a "decree of the (heavenly) watchers" and "the word of the holy ones," is giving utterance to a purely *heathen* notion, for which Dan. v. 21 afterward substitutes the correct expression, "decree of the Most High."

(7) See the description of the cherubim, § 119.

(8) Ps. xci. 11 : "The Lord gives His angels charge of the pious man, to keep him in all his ways." And xxxiv. 7 : "The angel of the Lord *encamps* round about them that fear Him."

(9) Ewald, *History of the People of Israel*, iii. p. 62, relies chiefly upon the passage cited, and is inclined to consider the meaning of the name which makes it designate God as Him who comes with all His heavenly hosts to help the armies of Israel, as the original one. He thinks, also, that the name took its rise at some time when the army of Israel, strengthened by the hosts of the Lord descending from heaven for their help, put their enemies to flight. [Comp. also *Lehre von Gott*, ii. p. 339.] The passage is certainly a chief passage, but still only one of the chief passages.

§ 198.

Result with respect to the Name Jehovah Sabaoth.

In summing up what has been said, we find that the *significance of the doctrine of Jehovah Sabaoth* consists in the fact that it teaches us to recognize not only the supermundane power and glory of the living God, but also makes Him known to us as interposing, according to His free and sovereign will, in the affairs of the world, and therefore not bound to the elements or forces of nature which obey Him ; but as having, on the contrary, not only these but also the spiritual powers of the heavenly world at His disposal for the execution of His will on earth (1). Hence this name not only expresses the contrast between Himself and a deification of the heavenly bodies, but also the general contrast between Himself and those heathen deities which are absorbed in nature and the world. Thus the contemplation of the Lord of the heavenly hosts is expanded to that of *the Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe.* So (according to what was remarked, § 195) Ps. xxiv. 10 ; Isa. vi. 3, li. 15, liv. 5 (2) ; Amos ix. 5, etc. The chief passage, however, in this respect is Jer. x. 16 in its connection with vers. 1–10. The name, however, as more nearly defining the idea of Jehovah (comp. what is said on this subject, § 41), refers pre-eminently to the *regal acts* of God, especially so far as these concern His battles, victories, and other manifestations of Divine sovereignty for the protection of His covenant people in opposition to a world which strives against them, as is proved by numerous passages in the Psalms and prophets ; comp. besides those above cited, Ps. xlvi. 7, 11, lxxx. 7, 14. The absence of the name from the monuments of the Hhokhma is explained by the circumstance that these do not relate to the revelation of the kingdom of God ; while its absence from the Pentateuch is accounted for by the inconsiderable part played by the heavenly hosts in comparison with the angel of the Lord (§ 61).—The element of Divine *transcendency* latent in the name, is subsequently embodied in the Divine appellation, "the God of heaven," which occurs Dan. ii. 37, 44, and in some passages of the Books of Esther and Nehemiah.

(1) [Schrader ("Der ursprungliche Sinn des Gottesnamens Jahve" in the *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.* 1875) designates this explanation of the name as "the entirely external conglomerate of almost all the principal attempts which are generally made to explain it." But it is certainly a fact that both stars and angels are regarded in the Old Testament as belonging to the army of God. Whether in the Hebrew mind the expression "God of hosts" designated both must be decided by an examination of the passages in which it occurs, and not *a priori*. The result is stated in the text. It cannot be maintained that the plural צְבָאוֹת cannot properly be used of the hosts of stars and angels, since the angels are mentioned in such passages as Deut. xxxiii. 2 and Dan. vii. 10 in such a manner that the idea of hosts is very naturally implied, and since in Ps. ciii. 21 hosts of angels are actually spoken of. The grounds on which Schrader would get rid of this plural are entirely insufficient. That the plural צְבָאוֹת in the few other passages in which it occurs, is used only of earthly armies is not decisive, since no internal reason can be shown for not employing it in relation to heavenly hosts. The assertion therefore, that "the name *cannot*, according to the *usus loquendi* of the Old Testament, have any other signification than God of the earthly armies," rests upon a weak foundation. Schrader's explanation is simple, and gives a unity of meaning, but it is imperfectly or not at all in harmony with many passages of the Old Testament, and he has not once made the attempt to show that his view satisfies the connections in which the name occurs.]

(2) In Isa. liv. 5, "The God of the whole earth shall He be called," corresponds with "The Lord of hosts is His name."

§ 199.

Angels of Higher Order and Special Office.

The later prophetical books speak of *angels of higher order and special calling* among the heavenly host. The cherubim, treated of in § 119, where it was remarked that they never appear as ministering spirits, are not among these. Some have also regarded the seraphim as merely symbolical beings, to be classed with the cherubim, since their characteristic features are combined with those of the cherubim in the description of the celestial living creatures (ζῶα) in Rev. iv. 8. [Comp. Cheyne, *Prophecies of Isaiah*, i. 36, 40–42, who takes the position that the popular notion of the seraphim as angels is to be rejected.—D.] Thus *e.g.* Hävernick (*Theologie des Alten Testaments*, p. 95) regards the seraphim, who represent the ideal creation under the form of light or fire, as a modification of the cherubim. But in the chapter in question (Isa. vi.) the only passage in which they occur, ver. 6, rather suggests *the ministry of angels;* though seraphim here cannot be said entirely to correspond with the *angelus interpres* in Zechariah and Daniel, for they *do not interpose as organs of revelation* between Jehovah and the prophet, who in ver. 8 is conscious that the Divine call is a direct one. The *symbolism of their appearance* is very simple. With two wings they cover their faces,—to indicate that even the most exalted spirits cannot bear the full vision of the Divine glory; with two they cover their feet,—to symbolize their reverence; with two they fly,—to express the swiftness with which they execute the Divine commands. In other respects they are evidently represented in human form: for faces, hands, and feet are spoken of. There is not a trace of the serpent form; and the combination of the name by which they are called with that of the poisonous kind of serpent called שָׂרָף is inadmissible, if only because it is impossible, according to the

Old Testament view, to make the serpent a symbol of anything sacred (2). The derivation of the name from the root שָׂרַף, to *burn*, would seem to be favored by the particular recorded ver. 7, where the seraph, as the divinely-appointed instrument for the expiation and purification of the prophet's mouth, appears with celestial fire, were it not that the meaning of the verbal root is active, to *consume* by fire (not to glow with heat, or anything similar). Hence the tracing of the word, as by many earlier writers, especially Steudel, *Theologie des A. T.* p. 225, to the Arabic root *sharupha* (*nobilis fuit*), whence comes *shariphun* (noble), is still, to say the least, equally admissible (3). According to this derivation, the seraphim would be thus designated as being the *most exalted* among celestial spirits, and might be regarded as the angelic princes, שָׂרִים, subsequently mentioned in the Book of Daniel, though the name would also correspond to the designation of angels in general, as אַבִּירִים, Ps. lxxviii. 25, and גִּבֹּרֵי כֹחַ, Ps. ciii. 20 (4).

The *seven angels* mentioned in Ezek. ix. as sent forth to execute the Divine sentence of extermination upon idolatrous Jerusalem, next come under consideration. The passage, indeed, by no means implies that there is a band of seven angels whose special vocation it is to be the watchmen and guardians of Jerusalem. For the *number seven* is here, as elsewhere in the Old Testament, the sign that a Divine operation is being completed, viz. in this passage the Divine judgment now advancing to its close, and there is no necessity for having recourse to the seven planet gods of the Babylonians (comp. Diodor. *Biblioth.* ii. 30) and the seven Amshaspands [angels of love and holiness] of the Persians. This heathen notion might rather be regarded as the foundation for the passage Tob. xii. 15 concerning the seven holy angels : *οἱ προσαναφέρουσι τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ εἰσπορεύονται ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἁγίου*, though this might also be founded on this vision of Ezekiel. It is, however, significant that in Ezekiel a seventh angel, distinguished by his high-priestly robe of linen, whose office it is to set a mark upon those who are to be delivered from the judgment about to be inflicted, comes forward before the other six who are to execute this judgment. This angel of special dignity corresponds to the *horseman* who, in the vision of Zech. i. 8, stands among the myrtle trees (which symbolize the covenant people), and is evidently the chief over those who run to and fro through the earth. To him they bring their report ; and he, upon receiving it, intercedes with the Lord of Hosts for Jerusalem. He seems also to be identical with the *angel of the Lord* in Zech. ch. iii., before whom Satan stands to accuse Joshua. In i. 12 he is distinguished from Jehovah, while he yet appears in the scene in ch. iii. as His representative, where the words spoken are now said to be the words of Jehovah, now of this angel,—thus recalling the Malakh of the Pentateuch (§ 59 sq.). His superior rank is especially evident when he is compared with the הַמַּלְאָךְ הַדֹּבֵר בִּי, the *angelus interpres* of Zechariah, who interprets to this prophet the meaning of the visions vouchsafed to him, but who is never regarded as the representative of Jehovah. It is very remarkable that, as Baumgarten (*Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja*, i. p. 68) very justly observes, this angel, in whom is the name of Jehovah, withdraws from the history of revelation so long as Israel is under a visible ruler of the house of David ; but now, when this visible rule is abrogated, an invisible ruler again appears, and attains a more concrete form, combined with personal agency, though at the same time distinguished from God.

In what has hitherto been said, the *names of the angels* have not yet been touched on: these, viz. מִיכָאֵל and גַּבְרִיאֵל, first appear in Daniel. To begin with the latter, גַּבְרִיאֵל, *i.e.* man of God, is said in the Book of Daniel to be the angel who explains the visions to Daniel, viii. 16, ix. 21, thus answering to the *angelus interpres* of Zechariah. It is, however, the מִיכָאֵל of the Book of Daniel who apparently corresponds to the angel of the Lord in Zechariah, the horseman among the myrtle trees, who advocates the cause of the covenant people. He is called, x. 13, "one of the chief princes" (אַחַד הַשָּׂרִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים); and xii. 1, "the great prince which standeth for the sons of thy people" (הַשַּׂר הַגָּדוֹל הָעֹמֵד עַל-בְּנֵי עַמֶּךָ); and in x. 21, briefly, "your prince" (שַׂרְכֶם). But nothing is said, at least in the Book of Daniel, of Michael being, like the ancient angel of the covenant (the bearer of the שֵׁם, of the Divine side of revelation), the descent of the Divine nature into the sphere of the creature. It is certainly true that the later Jewish theology identified Michael with the shekhina (5), while among moderns Hengstenberg identifies him with the Logos. Even his name is said by the latter to show that we should not seek for Michael in the region of the finite. The name, he says, signifies, Who is like me, who am God, in whom God's glory is manifested? מִיכָאֵל, however, actually appears, and that pretty frequently, in the Old Testament as the *name of a man*, from Num. xiii. 13 to Ezra viii. 8. For the rest, this name of the prince of the angels does not imply chiefly (as Caspari, *Ueber Micha*, p. 15, insists) a humble acknowledgment of the Divine incomparableness on the part of the angel, but is an actual statement concerning the angel himself, and expresses the *irresistibility of him to whom God gives the power to execute His behests* (6).

But *another appearance* in the Book of Daniel now claims our attention. According to ch. x., a man, called neither angel nor prince, but quite indefinitely אִישׁ-אֶחָד, appears to Daniel on the bank of the Tigris. This appearance, before which his human nature threatens to succumb, is, as already remarked, not Gabriel. It is the same person who at Ulai, viii. 15–17, commands Gabriel to interpret to Daniel the vision he had received,—the same who, xii. 7, guarantees by a solemn oath the fulfilment of the Divine counsel. It is obvious that this appearance must be identified with him who, vii. 13 (comp. especially x. 16, 18), comes as *a son of man* in the clouds of heaven to receive dominion over all nations, *i.e.* the *Messiah* (see below), the description of the glorified Christ, Rev. i. 13–15, being also taken from Dan. x. 5 sqq. (7). We next meet in the Book of Daniel with the remarkable phenomenon that the ancient Malakh becomes, on the one hand, the angel Michael, who, though highly exalted among the angels, is still hypostatically distinct from Jevovah; while, on the other, One appears whom Michael serves as a helper. That dominion over the earth should be given to this Being, is quite consistent with the description given in ch. x. This unnamed Being declares, ver. 13, that he has already contended with שַׂר מַלְכוּת פָּרַס, the prince of the kingdom of Persia, that Michael then came to help him, and that thus he remained the conqueror of the kings of Persia. In ver. 20 sq. he proceeds to say that he is about to depart again to fight with the שַׂר פָּרַס, the prince of Persia, that then the שַׂר-יָוָן, the prince of Greece, will also come, and that none will help him against these two except מִיכָאֵל שַׂרְכֶם, Michael your prince. It is quite

erroneous to suppose the princes of Persia and Greeee to be earthly kings (Hävernick and others),—the שַׂר of Persia being in fact distinguished from the kings of Persia. They are *angels* in whom the power of Persia and Greece, which exalted itself against the kingdom of God and strove to frustrate His counsel, is *personified;* and whether they are regarded as tutelary powers or as representatives of the national spirit, is a matter of comparative indifference.—What has already been advanced will help to facilitate the explanation of the passage with which we shall close this subject, viz. Isa. xxiv. 21. In that day, says the prophet (in which the secular power shall be humbled), "the Lord shall punish the *host of the high ones on high* (צְבָא הַמָּרוֹם בַּמָּרוֹם) and the kings of the earth upon the earth, and they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited" (8). And first, the theory which regards the צְבָא הַמָּרוֹם as only the high and powerful ones of earth must be rejected, for בַּמָּרוֹם is evidently *antithetical* to עַל-הָאֲדָמָה. What is here spoken of is, on the contrary, a judgment in the invisible world corresponding to the judgment upon the mighty ones of earth. This judgment in the invisible world, viewed in the light cast upon it by the passage in Daniel, is a judgment inflicted upon the spiritual powers in heaven who represent and answer to the earthly powers. [If the expression "high ones on high" is understood of stars (personified) or angels, or both, *regarded* and *worshipped* by the heathen as heavenly powers, of whom punishment is figuratively predicated, no literal punishment of angels is taught in the passage.—D.] We find, then, already in the Old Testament, the doctrine further developed in the New, that the dispensations and judgments of God upon earth are closely connected with corresponding events in the higher world of spirits (9).

(1) [Riehm (art. "Seraph" in his *Handwörterbuch*) holds that the conception of the seraphim was developed from that of the cherubim, and that they were really cherubim conceived of more as angels, and not as bearers, but heralds of the holy majesty of God in the praises they offered.]

(2) The reference of the seraphim to the Egyptian Serapis has only the value of a mere fancy. [It is advanced by Hitzig, p. 46 sq., who also maintains that the conception of the Seraphim is connected with the worship of the serpent, and with the serpent mentioned in Num. xxi. 9. Against this comp. Riehm in the article just cited.]

(3) So also Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.*, p. 579, "Princes."

(4) Hofmann (in his *Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 376) regards the seraphim after this last manner. His identification of them, however, with the תְּרָפִים is utterly improbable.

(5) Compare the passages in Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talmude illustratum*, p. 717 sqq., where Adhonai, Michael, and Shekhina are considered identical. It is said, *e.g.*, that the three angels who visited Abraham were Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, and that Michael is the same as Adhonai.

(6) It is quite certain, notwithstanding all that Hengstenberg says, that in Jude, ver. 9, and Rev. xii. 7 sqq., Michael is not identified with the Son of God. See, in opposition to Hengstenberg, Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 127 sqq.; *Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 340 sqq.

(7) This view, which is found among the older theologians, especially Chr. B. Michaelis (*Uberiores adnot. in Dan.* p. 372), is advocated among moderns, particularly by Schmieder (in von Gerlach's *Bibelwerk*), Hilgenfeld (*Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, p. 47 sqq.), and Keil.

(8) It cannot be with certainty decided whether the meaning of the last word (פָּקַד, in Niph.) is: they shall be reserved for the final judgment, to which 2 Pet. ii. 4 and Jude 6 are parallel; or, they are shut up for a season and then liberated, which sense is favored by the parallel expression in Isa. xxiii. 17.

(9) Post-canonical Jewish writings teach the doctrine of *tutelary spirits of whole nations*. The LXX have introduced this notion into Deut. xxxii. 8, where they translate *ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὑψιστος ἐθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ, ἐστησεν ὁρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ* (Hebrew: לְמִסְפַּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). As seventy heathen nations were enumerated in the table of nations, so were there supposed to be seventy angels, one for each nation and language. Two more *names of angels* are mentioned in the Old Testament Apocrypha, viz. Raphael in the Book of Tobit (the name—God heals—referring to the contents of the book), and Uriel in the Fourth Book of Ezra. According to a Rabbinical statement, the names of angels *ascenderunt in manu Israelis ex Babylone;* and this may be correct, inasmuch as Babylonian notions seem to have exercised an influence upon the subsequent development of angelology, especially in the Apocrypha.

§ 200.

The Doctrine of Satan.

Among the angels, the sons of God (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, as they are called in the Book of Job) who appear before Jehovah, we meet, in certain passages of the Old Testament, viz. in the prologue to the Book of Job, in Chronicles, and Zechariah, with *an angel called* הַשָּׂטָן, *of crafty and hostile disposition toward the covenant people and all who fear God, seeking to deprive them of the favor of God, but only suffered to act as His instrument*. The word שָׂטָן is properly an appellative, meaning an *enemy*, an *adversary:* it is thus used, Num. xxii. 22, of the angel who obstructs the way of Balaam; and in Ps. cix. 6, where Luther incorrectly translates it as a proper name, *Satan*, as שׂוֹטֵן, ver. 29 of the same psalm, shows. [The marginal rendering of A. V. is to be preferred, *an adversary*.—D.]

To exhibit *the internal connection between the doctrine of Satan and the other doctrines of the Old Testament*, we begin with two parallel passages, 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 and 1 Chron. xxi. 1. We are here told that David had conceived the proud, and therefore God-displeasing, notion of numbering the people (comp. § 165). This is thus expressed in the older record, 2 Sam.: "The wrath of God moved David (הַסִּית) to say, Go, number Israel." The later account (1 Chron.) says: "*Satan* stood up against Israel, and moved David." Thus that which is by the *older* record directly referred to Divine agency, viz. that *external manifestation* of an inward sin (here David's pride), which is necessary in order to judgment being inflicted upon it (comp. § 54. 2), is by the later account attributed to a *hostile spirit*, to whom God gives the power of using the guilty inclinations of man to cause him to fall. Here, then, we again meet with the same fact which we encountered in the doctrine of the angels, viz. that the later record brings into greater prominence those powers which are the *instruments* of the Divine providence. But even in the older accounts, that Divine causality which is active in human sin is distinguished from the ordinary Divine agency; comp. the passage 1 Sam. xvi. 14–23, already briefly noticed in § 65. When the Spirit of the Lord, רוּחַ יְהוָה, departed from Saul on account of his sin, an evil spirit from the Lord

troubled him, רוּחַ־רָעָה מֵאֵת יְהוָה, which evil spirit is afterward called, ver. 15, רוּחַ־אֱלֹהִים רָעָה, and more briefly, ver. 23, רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים. Thus we find that a Divine [*i.e.* a divinely permitted] agency, differing from the Divine life-giving principle active in the world, rules in the domain of sin, and especially in the province of obduracy. Other passages also point to such potencies appointed by God to be the instruments of the Divine wrath. Thus we are told, Isa. xix. 14, that God had mingled a רוּחַ עִוְעִים, a perverse spirit, in the heart of the Egyptians, which, as a matter of judgment, would render them capable of acting only in a perverse manner. To such passages belong also those in which the wrath of God is spoken of as *a cup*, of which they are compelled to drink who have incurred His judgment; comp. as the chief passage, Ps. lxxv. 8; also Jer. xxv. 15 sqq., Isa. li. 17, Ps. lx. 3. The transition hence to the doctrine of Satan is made by the passage 1 Kings xxii. 19 sqq. Micaiah the prophet relates a vision to the kings Ahab and Jehoshaphat. He saw the Lord sitting upon His heavenly throne, and all the host of heaven standing on His right hand and on His left. The Lord asks who will persuade Ahab to undertake, for his ruin, *i.e.* that he may meet his death, a war against the Syrians. Then the spirit (הָרוּחַ, incorrectly translated "a spirit") comes forth from among the heavenly host, and says: I will persuade him. The Lord says: Wherewith? The spirit answers: I will be a רוּחַ שֶׁקֶר (a lying spirit) in the mouth of all his prophets. The Lord says: Thou shalt persuade him, and also prevail; go and do so. Here, then, that power which is instrumental in bringing about the Divine judgment *hovers between personification* [or figurative imagery] *and proper personal existence.* The advance to the actual doctrine of Satan is not, however, made by merely representing the principle which tempts man to sin as *concrete personality*, but consists especially in the fact that Satan, though absolutely dependent on the Divine will with regard to what he effects, acts from *a disposition hostile to man.* This is hinted, 1 Chron. xxi. 1, in the standing up of Satan against Israel, and still more prominently brought forward in the prologue to Job, ch. i. sqq. It is true that Satan there appears in the midst of the בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים [the sons of God or angels]; but he comes from a wandering excursion over the earth, which he has evidently undertaken from hostility to men. It is evident that he does not question Job's righteousness for the sake of affording an occasion for confirming it, which is the purpose of God's counsel, but because he hopes that Job's piety will not endure temptation, and that he will thus cease to be an object of the Divine complacency. That he may bring calamity upon Job, the Lord allows Satan the free disposal not only of the elements,—the tempest, and the fire of heaven,—but also of human beings (the nomadic hordes), and at length he is permitted to smite him with a most terrible disease. But he is obliged to obtain from God the power of effecting all this; and the limit to the injury he is allowed to inflict is set by the will of God; comp. ii. 6.

Of special significance, however, is *the position of Satan with respect to the covenant people.* This is shown with particular clearness in Zech. iii., while it is also briefly alluded to 1 Chron. xxi. The vision in Zechariah is as follows:—Joshua the high priest stands in unclean garments before the angel of the Lord, and Satan stands at his right hand to accuse him. The Lord repels with threats the accusations of Satan, acquits the high priest, and commands him, as a token of his

acquittal, to put on clean festal garments. This passage has been by some expositors most erroneously referred to the slanders uttered against the people and Joshua at the Persian court: for how could an accusation to the Persian king be possibly represented by the prophet as being at the same time an accusation to the Lord? The high priest is the representative of the people (1). He is accused before the Lord, not on account of his own sins as an individual, but in his capacity of high priest. His priestly garments are defiled. Satan affirms that for this sinful people there is no valid mediation before God: that Israel is rejected because there is no longer an atonement for them. The Lord will, however, have pity, according to ver. 2, on this brand plucked from the fire, the remnant of His people, and will not regard their sin. He therefore causes the high priest to be clothed in clean garments, thus acknowledging the validity of the high-priestly mediation, though with an intimation, ver. 8, that the perfect atonement for the people is to be effected only by the Messiah. Thus the work of Satan is to question the forgiveness, the justification of the church, in which sense he is called, Rev. xii. 10, "the accuser of our brethren." Hence he is here represented as the opposite of the angel of the Lord, who, according to Zech. i. 12 (like the high priest on earth), stands before the Lord to intercede for the people. With respect also to his agency among men, Satan, who desires (Job i.) to destroy the souls of men (see the particulars, § 197), forms a contrast to the מְלִיץ מַלְאָךְ, Job xxxiii. 23, whose occupation it is to excite men to repentance and confession of sin, that their souls may be rescued from destruction.

The allusion just made to the organic connection between the doctrine of Satan and other Old Testament doctrines, testifies decidedly *against the theory which derives it from the Persian religion* (1). Quite apart from the fact that in pre-Babylonian times, to which the Book of Job must unquestionably be referred (2), the notion of Persian influence is inconceivable, the Satan of the Old Testament does not have *essential characteristics* which must be present to justify a comparison with Ahriman. [For] the monism of the Old Testament utterly excludes the admission of a hostile principle opposed from eternity to God; nor does it know as yet of a kingdom of darkness over which Satan presides with relative independence. The Satan of the Old Testament is not as yet the ἀρχὴν τοῦ κόσμου of the *New Testament*, which discloses the βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ only along with the completion of revelation. The New Testament doctrine of the κόσμος, and of its antagonism to the kingdom of God, finds its parallel in the Old Testament in the conflict between the secular monarchies and the kingdom of God in Israel; but though (as we have seen in the preceding section) this conflict is in Dan. x. and Isa. xxiv. connected with occurrences in the world of spirits, Satan does not appear upon the scene.

Of other *evil angels* nothing is *distinctly taught* in the Old Testament. By *Azazel*, Lev. xvi., we must probably understand, according to what was said, Part I. (§ 140), an evil spiritual power whom we may (with Hengstenberg) connect with the Satan of the later books, though in the Old Testament itself the middle terms necessary to prove the connection of the two do not exist.

It is true that the destroyers (מְמִתִּים), who are in Job xxxiii. 22 contrasted with the מְלִיץ מַלְאָךְ, must probably be referred not to fatal diseases, but to *angels*; this does not, however, imply that the Old Testament teaches the doctrine of a special

class of angels of death, like the angel of death (Samael) of the later Jewish theology. It is not the *nature* of these angels, but the *Divine commission*, which makes them destroyers. So also in Ps. lxxviii. 49, the מלאכי רעים are not evil angels, who would have been called מַלְאָכִים רָעִים, but *angeli malorum*, angels of evil, who ministered in the Egyptian plagues as the instruments of God, the collective conception of the מַשְׁחִית, who, according to Ex. xii. 13, 23, executes the last judgment upon the Egyptians, but who, as the מַלְאַךְ מַשְׁחִית, 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 1 Chron. xxi. 15, comp. Isa. xxxvii. 36, is the angel of the Lord (3). The spectral being לִילִית, Isa. xxxiv. 14, *i.e. nocturna* [A. V. *screech-owl*, better *night monster*], regarded by the Talmudists as a demon who specially lies in wait [by night] for children, and the שְׂעִירִים, xiii. 21, by which goat-footed demons are usually understood, cannot of course be comprised in the category of evil *angels*, apart from the fact that not a word is said in these passages concerning the real existence of such sprites (4). [They were probably mere creatures of the popular superstition. D.]

(1) [Comp. the judgment of Ewald (*Lehre von Gott*, ii. p. 298 sq.): "Down to Zech. iii. 3, the whole conception of Satan in its origin and significance is so purely Hebraistic, that nothing can be more groundless and preposterous than to derive it from abroad. To suppose, as has been done of late, that a Persian origin of Satan is firmly established is entirely unhistorical and without foundation." Hitzig also observes, p. 66: "The idea of Satan might very well proceed from the national development of theological thought."]

(2) [Comp. Strack in Zöckler, i. p. 157 sqq.]

(3) The saying of Ode (*De angelis*, p. 741), *Deum ad puniendos* malos homines *mittere* bonos angelos, *et ad castigandos* pios *usurpare* malos, may so far be recognized as Old Testament doctrine.

(4) The later Jewish theology, on the contrary, presents us with a fully developed demonology, traces of which are found in the Asmodæus of the apocryphal Book of Tobit.

SECOND DIVISION.

MAN'S RELIGIOUS AND MORAL RELATION TO GOD.

I. DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE CEREMONIAL AND THE MORAL LAW.

§ 201.

The ceremonial and moral precepts are (as has been shown in Part I. § 84) in the Mosaic law co-ordinate. The object and meaning of the law are, however, shown, as was there pointed out, on the one hand, by the motives set forth for fulfilling the commands; on the other, by the fact that even the ceremonial ordinances are everywhere translucent with a spiritual meaning. Hence it is but a result of that tuition of the law which advances from the outer to the inner, that *prophecy* should *carry out the distinction* between the ceremonial and the moral law, and emphatically declare that the performance of the external ordinances of the law, and especially the offering of sacrifice, were, as merely

outward acts, worthless: that the will of God aimed at the sanctification of the heart and the surrender of the will to God; and that the observance of the ceremonial law had no value except *as the expression of a godly disposition*. The words of Samuel to Saul (1 Sam. xv. 22, § 164, and note 3) may in this respect, as we have already remarked, be regarded as the programme of prophecy. The same thought forms the *theme of many prophetic addresses*; comp. as chief passages Hos. vi. 6, Amos v. 21 sqq., Isa. i. 11 sqq., lviii. 3 sqq., Jer. v. 20, vii. 21 sqq., xiv. 12, Mic. vi., 6 sqq. (1). Many passages in the Psalms also declare obedience to the Divine will, the thwarting of self-will and pride, and the struggle for the purification of the inner man, to be the sacrifice acceptable to God: comp. Ps. xl. 7, l., li. 18 sq. So, too, a godly life and all that appertains thereto is often the subject of psalms in which not a word is said of sacrifice; see *e.g.* how purity of heart and conduct are brought forward, Ps. xxiv. 4–6, and xv., as the tokens by which the genuine covenant people are to be recognized. *On the other hand*, however, the experience of the Divine favor is, in the view of the Psalmist, connected with the sanctuary and its acts of worship, on which account these are the objects of delight and aspiration: comp. xxvi. 7 sq., xxvii. 4, Ps. xlii. sq., lxiii., lxxxiv. The latter contains a hint of the *manner in which the protest of the prophets against the rites of worship* must be regarded. According to a view frequently advanced, the prophets are said to have been opposed to sacrificial services in general, while *Jeremiah* in particular is declared to have denied to the whole sacrificial system the character of a Divine institution (so Hitzig, Graf, and others): see vi. 20, but especially vii. 22 sq. (2). These passages are not to be got over by the distinction that the private sacrifices of the law were for the most part voluntary, that the law merely prescribed the *manner* in which they should be offered (so Schmieder), and that the positive injunction of sacrifice related chiefly to *public offerings*, of which Jeremiah was not here speaking. Nor can Jeremiah's recognition of the ceremonial law be argued from the fact that he speaks so severely against the desecration of the Sabbath, since the commandment to hallow it is found in the Decalogue. If, however, Jeremiah had actually rejected the whole law of sacrifice, how *comes he to have admitted sacrificial service into his announcement of the times of salvation*, not only in xxxiii. 18,—a passage whose genuineness has been groundlessly disputed,—but also in xvii. 26, xxxi. 14, xxxiii. 11? The fact is, that in the passages above quoted from Jeremiah and others, a *relative* declaration is expressed as an *absolute* one, for the sake of laying the whole stress upon one member of the sentence (3): God so greatly desires heart service,—the demand of this is so entirely the main point,—that He is said not to desire sacrifice in *comparison* therewith. Burnt-offering and sacrifice He does not desire, in the sense in which a self-righteous generation, assuming that He needed such sacrifices, and thinking to satisfy Him by such an external performance, would offer them. Where, however, there is a right state of heart, and God therefore graciously accepts His people, external offerings are acceptable to Him as proofs of inward devotion (4). Hence the exhortation, Ps. iv. 5, "Offer זִבְחֵי צֶדֶק, sacrifices of righteousness" (5), comp. Deut. xxxiii. 19; and hence Ps. li., which in ver. 18 declares a broken heart to be the true sacrifice, concludes, ver. 20 sq., with the words: "Do good in Thy good pleasure unto Zion: build Thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteous-

ness, with burnt-offerings and whole burnt-offerings: then shall they offer bullocks upon Thine altar." It was for this reason, too, that the prophets, as has been already shown with respect to Jeremiah, expressly assume that the church of the future will have an external ritual, though without sin-offerings (because sin is forgiven). Thus Deutero-Isaiah, *e.g.* lxvi. 1–3, who declares that no temple is to be built by the sin-defiled mass of the exiles, and calls their sacrifices an abomination, yet predicts, lvi. 7, lx. 7, lxvi. 20, for the new Jerusalem a new temple and a new sacrificial service (which are best understood, in accordance with the spiritual nature of Christianity, in a figurative sense.—D.).

These considerations also sufficiently indicate the judgment to be formed upon the assertion that the above-mentioned prophets are *opposed by other prophets who are charged with a one-sided Levitism, for insisting upon the observance of the ceremonial law*. These latter are said to be Ezekiel, Daniel, and Malachi (comp. De Wette, *Einleitung*, 6th ed. § 223, 8th ed. § 278). Ezekiel, it is true, does set a high value upon the external ordinances of the Mosaic law. And this is quite in keeping with the *priestly character of this prophet*, who emphatically declares, iv. 14, that he had never in his life eaten anything unclean; who contends, as Jeremiah had also done (see above, and comp. also Isa. lviii. 13 sq.), for the sanctification of the Sabbath, ch. xx., as being a sign between Jehovah and His people, ver. 12; and who describes at great length in the prophecy, ch. xl.–xlviii., the restoration of the Levitical ritual upon a magnificent scale in the coming times of redemption,—a subject to which Jeremiah also briefly alludes. That he did not, however, regard sanctification as consisting in such externalism, is shown not only by his description of the righteous man (in ch. xviii.) as one who practises no idolatry, commits no adultery or unchastity, is not harsh to his debtor, is merciful to the needy, and does not seek to enrich himself in unrighteous ways, but more especially by his predictions, hereafter to be considered, of the restoration of Israel as the covenant people. For the essential condition of this restoration is to be the outpouring of that Divine Spirit which shall create in them a *new heart*, xi. 19, xxxvi. 26, an inward conversion being thus reflected in these external ordinances. It must, moreover, be remembered how important the observance of these ritual observances was (as remarked § 188), especially during the captivity, as a *means of fencing the people* and protecting them against heathenism (6). It is true also that Malachi sternly rebukes transgressions in the matter of Divine worship, the offering of bad or defective sacrifices, i. 6–ii. 9, the fraudulent withholding of the temple dues, iii. 7–12; but he does so because the worldly and godless disposition of priests and people was manifested by such actions. Those sacrifices which the people, purified by judgments, shall offer in righteousness (בְּצֶדֶק), shall be pleasant to the Lord, iii. 3 sq.

Finally, with respect to the *Book of Daniel*, the attempt to show that it is opposed to the older prophetical books, by its commendation of a legal externalism, is equally and utterly vain. Daniel abstains, i. 8 sqq., from partaking of the dainties of the royal table, because he considers them defiling,—not exactly in the sense in which, in the passage Hos. ix. 4 (elsewhere, § 136, and note 2, discussed in a different connection), the food of the people in captivity is called polluted (7), but undoubtedly because at the royal repasts it *would be impossible to avoid violations of the Mosaic injunctions* concerning different kinds of food, and

the eating of flesh sacrificed to idols. Equal strictness is, however, shown not only by Ezekiel, xxii. 26, xliv. 23, but also by Deutero-Isaiah, in the passages against the eating of swine's flesh and other unclean animals, lxv. 4, lxvi. 17. It has been also said to be a sign of the externalism of Daniel's religion, that, according to vi. 17, he prayed three times daily, a custom alluded to so early as Ps. lv. 17. This, however, can give offence to those only who consider it unfavorable to piety to have any set times of prayer, while the circumstance of his turning in prayer toward Jerusalem, as prescribed in 1 Kings viii. (comp. § 62), was now in the captivity a very natural expression of that yearning toward the holy city which every Israelite felt who believed in the Divine promises. The chief stress is, however, laid upon Dan. iv. 27, which is said to attribute a propitiatory power to almsgiving. Daniel here says to Nebuchadnezzar: "Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness (8), and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor, if it may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity." In thus speaking, however, he is not inculcating a righteousness of dead works, but pointing out to Nebuchadnezzar the particulars in which especially his change of heart would be shown, just as when the Apostle Paul urged the heathen, Rom. ii. 7, *καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητεῖν*: comp. ver. 10. The exegesis which finds in Daniel the notion that sin might be expiated and prosperity insured by almsgiving, must also find in Isaiah (ch. lviii.)—the prophet to whom none have yet denied the spirit of genuine prophecy—that fasting is indeed displeasing to God, but that external acts of benevolence and the external observance of the Sabbath furnish a claim to Divine favor and constitute human righteousness; whereas the prophet is only naming those external works in which genuine piety will be chiefly manifested. How far the Book of Daniel is from commending a righteousness of dead works, is best seen by the thoroughly penitential prayer, ch. ix., 4 sqq.

(1) In Mic. vi. 6 sqq. the prophet says: "Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the most high God? shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" A similar testimony accompanies every restoration of outward worship from David onward.

(2) In Jer. vi. 20, the prophet represents Jehovah as saying: "Your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices pleasing unto me;" and vii. 22 sq.: "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you," etc. [On the latter passage, which has largely been brought into discussion of late, especially in what has been written on the legislation in the Pentateuch, comp. on the one side Wellhausen, i. p. 61, and Duhm, p. 232; on the other side Bredenkamp, p. 102 sqq., and Orelli in his supplement to the article "Opfercultus des A. T." in Herzog, 2d ed. xi. p. 59. Bredenkamp has justly pressed the point, that since the recognition, by the supporters of the Graf school, of Jeremiah's acquaintance with the book of the covenant and Deuteronomy excludes the explanation of the passage according to which Jeremiah denies to the

sacrificial worship the character of a divine and Mosaic institution; they must either, with Duhm, regard it as possible that one and the same Jeremiah "favored the drift of Deuteronomy, at least in general, and for this reason probably was persecuted by the priests of his paternal city, Anathoth" (p. 232), and yet "rejected as well the external worship of God as the external reverence for him" (p. 231); or they must believe with Wellhausen, that Jeremiah in his youth contributed to the introduction of the (Deuteronomic) law, but subsequently declared with reference to this law: "the false pen of the scribes hath wrought for falsehood" (i. p. 419, note). In opposition to the explanation given in the text, which is also supported by Orelli, Bredenkamp proposes another rendering, according to which עַל־דִּבְרִי is not to be translated "concerning," which it cannot mean, but "on account of, for the sake of," or what is still more preferable, he would read עַל־דְּבָרִי or דְּבָרִי "for my sake." The meaning would then be, that the offering and the accepting of sacrifices was not the aim of the divine command, but that the object of God was to secure moral obedience.]

(3) See how Winer, *Grammatik des neutest. Sprachidioms*, sec. 7. p. 462 sq., and Buttmann, *Grammatik des neutest. Sprachgebrauchs*, p. 306, elucidate this subject by a series of examples.

(4) As Samuel himself, according to the account in the First Book of Samuel, ministered at the sacrificial service.

(5) In Ps. iv. 5, צֶדֶק is not itself the offering to be brought.

(6) Ezekiel may have contributed not a little to the Levitical spirit which prevailed after the captivity, though its degeneration did not originate with him. (Art. "Prophetenthum des A. T.")

(7) The passage Hos. ix. 4 also shows the importance attributed to sacrifice even by Hosea, notwithstanding his rebuke of the *opus operatum*.

(8) It is arbitrary to make צְדָקָה here exactly = alms giving. [The only ground for it is the fact that the Hebrew word is sometimes used to indicate a righteousness which exhibts itself in acts of kindness and love. The signification "alms" (Theod. Vulg.) for the Chaldee word occurs in the Targums and the Rabbinical books, but not in the Bible.—D.]

II. THE RUINOUS NATURE OF SIN. THE NEED OF A NEW DISPENSATION OF GRACE.

§ 202.

In proportion as a consciousness of the inwardness of the law's requirements is arrived at, will the *conviction of sin* become profound. It is in this respect that prophecy, by bringing into greater prominence the *opposition* in which the people stand to the electing and sanctifying purpose of their God, *carries on the office of the law*, nay, advances to the perception that that sanctification of the people at which the law aims, is unattainable during the present legal dispensation, and must, on the contrary, be effected by a *new dispensation of grace*.

The tuition of the *law*, making man conscious of the contrast he exhibits to the Divine will, by holding this will up before him as in a mirror, and effecting *a conviction of sin* by its testimony against the people, Deut. xxxi. 26,—this process is one which advances but gradually. We cannot expect at once to find in the Old Testament such an *ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας* as is expressed in Rom. vii. When the godly man of the Old Testament meditated on the law, and strove to live in obedience thereto, its first impression was a reviving one, Ps. xix. 8 sqq.; Ps. cxix. He obtained, by its enlightening effect, a delight in the commandments of God, and thus the law in some sense became internal, as it is said, xxxvii. 31, "The law

of his God is in his heart;" and he attained something of that willing spirit, li. 14, by which he could say, xl. 8, "I delight to do Thy will, O my God: yea, Thy law is within my heart." But even in the psalm (xix.) already quoted, the praise of the law is combined, 13 sq., with a prayer for the pardon of secret sins of infirmity and for preservation from presumptuous sins; and thus a feeling of man's failure to come up to the requirements of the law finds expression. When David, after falling into gross sin, prayed, li. 10, "Create in me (בְּרָא־לִי) a clean heart, O God, and renew a firm spirit within me;" and, ver. 12, "Uphold me with a willing spirit," comp. cxliii. 10, he expressed an acknowledgment that a Divine impartation of life, a transformation of heart, was needed if the inward state was to be conformed to the Divine will.

Such an acknowledgment is made by *prophecy*. *But it puts the question thus: How has the nation conformed to its Divine destination?* How far has a community consecrated to God been really formed under the ordinances of the law? In making this inquiry, prophecy encounters on every side a falling away from God, which, after the failure of every remedy, proves that the vocation of the covenant people is not to be realized under the existing dispensation. The course followed in this respect by the prophetic addresses is generally as follows:— 1st. *What has God done for Israel? has He omitted aught of mercy or discipline* which might conduce to the deliverance of His people, as the remedy of their faults? and 2d. *How have the people requited His love and care? how can they meet their God if He enters into judgment with them?* Comp. such prophetic passages as Isa. i. 5, Mic. vi., Jer. ii. 1, iii. 5, and many others.

To render evident that relation of electing and sanctifying love into which God has entered with His people, the prophets do indeed employ the figure of *fatherhood and sonship*, discussed in § 82. 1; see *e.g.* Hos. xi. 1 (comp. § 82, note 1), Isa. i. 1, 2 sqq. (1), xxx. 1, 9, and other passages there quoted. But *the bridal and conjugal relation* is far more frequently used by them, as the *symbol of the communion into which God has entered with His people* (2). This is done especially by the prophets Hosea, Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It is sufficient to refer to the allegory in Ezek. xvi. and Jer. ii. 2 sq., already mentioned in a different connection (§ 27, 88, note 2) (3). *How then does the nation now appear?* It has become a *harlot, an adulteress*. In this symbol, *sin is no longer mere disobedience* to the commands of Him who has a right to demand obedience, but is viewed as being in its inward and essential nature a *breach of faith*, as *base ingratitude* toward Him who has first loved. It is true that it is *chiefly* apostasy to strange gods and to heathen practices in general which are regarded, *e.g.* in Hos. ii., Jer. iii. 1 sqq., etc., in the light of whoredom, as it is expressly called in Lev. xx. 5. Still *every kind of rebellion* against God falls under this same condemnation, inasmuch as in every sin man sets himself in opposition to Him who alone has acquired a right to the full submission of the heart; compare Num. xiv. 33, also *e.g.* Isa. i. 21 (in connection with the preceding), Ps. lxxiii. 27, comp. with ver. 26 and other passages (4). Considered in this light, all boasting of human righteousness vanishes, and an overwhelming feeling of guilt is expressed in many prophetic discourses. It is, *first of all, a common guilt resting upon the nation*, and making the nation as such—the whole community—the object of the Divine wrath, which is spoken of. In Mic. vii. 9, *e.g.*, it is Israel who says, "I will bear the indignation of the Lord,

because I have sinned against Him;" while in Deutero-Isaiah, especially, it is repeatedly declared that the people have no claim with respect to God, that all their righteousness is vain, that they have incurred only punishment and rejection, and are indebted for every benefit they receive to the free grace of God, xliii. 24, xlviii. 8–11, etc. In Dan. ix. 4 sqq., too, especially ver. 18, the same feeling is expressed (5).

From this general sinfulness, even the *more religious* part of the nation, the servants of God, are not so exempt as to be contrasted, as absolutely righteous, with the *perdita massa*. An Isaiah feels himself, vi. 5, not only to be dwelling in the midst of an unclean people, but also to be himself a man of unclean lips, and therefore to need Divine atonement and cleansing before he can undertake the office of a reprover. Caspari (*Ueber Micha*, p. 336) is certainly mistaken when he understands the passage Mic. vii. 9 to exclude the godly from the confession of sin there made by the people. Deutero-Isaiah also declares, xliii. 27: "Thy first father (*i.e.* Abraham or Jacob, comp. § 74) hath sinned, and thine advocates (intercessors, מְלִיצִים, such men as Moses, Samuel, Elijah, and other prophets, who by their godliness and intercessions stood in the breach for the people) have transgressed against me." The same prophet, moreover, in the prayer lxiv. 6, "We are all as an unclean thing, all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away," does not exclude himself from this common sin and guilt; and Ps. cxxx. 3, "If Thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, *who* shall stand?" is of general application.

The history of the people having thus shown that they had failed at the present stage of revelation to attain that righteousness which avails before God, and to realize the purpose of their election, the conviction forced itself on the mind that a *new dispensation of grace* is needed; in other words, that God must of His own free grace blot out transgression, and, as the passage Deut. xxx. 6 (discussed in § 8, note 4, and § 90), shows, effect by a new communication of life that conformity to His will which the law demands. The chief passages in which this is expressed are found in *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel*. Thus in Jer. xxiv. 7 the prophet declares that God will give to the people, whom He will bring again to their own land, a heart to know Him; with which may be compared Isaiah's announcement, that God will in the times of redemption *give* to the people that susceptibility for the reception of His word which they now lack; see xxix. 18 sqq., xxx. 20 sq., xxxii. 3, in opposition to xxix. 9 sqq., xxx. 9. The *principal passage*, however, in which the contrast between the future and the old dispensation is brought forward, is that important prediction of the *new covenant*, xxxi. 31 sqq.: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they brake." Then follow the words וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָּם, which may be understood, "when I had betrothed them to myself," or more correctly, "though I am *lord* over them" (6). It is further said: "But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall

be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." The chief thing, or rather the fundamental assumption in this new dispensation is, as the passage from Jeremiah expresses at its close, the *abolition of the old condemnation by Divine mercy;* that God, as the prophet Micah says, vii. 19, would of His mercy subdue the iniquities of His people, and cast all their sins into the depths of the sea. The expression יִכְבֹּשׁ עֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ (he will *subdue* our iniquities) in the last passage implies that the sin of the people had become a power which only the grace of God could overcome. But the whole difficulty of the task of training Israel is expressed in the passage, Isa. xliii. 24, where the God who calls worlds into existence by His word says, when speaking of His many and vain attempts to rescue His people from their sins, "Thou hast made me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities" (7).

It is through the pardon of sin that occasion is afforded for the *agency of those purifying and sanctifying forces* which God puts forth,—a fact thus expressed, Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean," etc. That which was signified by the legal rites of purification shall then become a reality. Zechariah also prophesies, xiii. 1, of the fountain to be opened in the times of redemption for sin and uncleanness. Then there will be no longer need to exclaim with Deut. v. 29, "O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always;" for God will, according to the prospect held out, xxx. 6 (comp. § 88), of a circumcision of the heart, work in them a susceptibility for the Divine, a willingness to perform His will. The people no longer encounter the law in its rigid objectivity; but God will, in the times of the new covenant, write it in their hearts, and, as Ezekiel continues in the passage quoted, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh; and I will put my Spirit within you, and *cause* you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them" (comp. xi. 19 sq., xxxvii. 23–27). How that direct teaching of God spoken of in the passage of Jeremiah, "They shall no more teach every man his neighbor," etc., is combined herewith, will be subsequently discussed (§ 223).

(1) Isa. i. 2: "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me."

(2) A view which at the same time testifies to the moral depth attributed by the prophets to this earthly relation.

(3) Ezek. xvi. The people in Egypt was a poor, helpless, abandoned child: "I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood. I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live." (It grew up a maiden, still in poverty and nakedness.) And when the time was come that God could woo His people, "I sware unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee (at Sinai), . . . thou becamest mine." According to Jer. ii. 2, the leading in the wilderness was the time of espousal, etc.

(4) Num. xiv. 33 uses זְנוּת of the declension of the people in general. Isa. i. 21: "How is the faithful city become a harlot!" The contrast exhibited, Ps. lxxiii., between vers. 26 and 27 is specially to be observed. With the godly man

who says, "God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever," are contrasted those that are far from God, that play the harlot from Him (כָּל־זוֹנָה מִמֶּךָּ).

(5) Dan. ix. 18: "We do not present our supplications before Thee for our righteousness, but for Thy great mercies."

(6) Comp. Jer. iii. 14. Similarly, but too specifically, does Ewald understand "though I was their protector." Luther's translation, "and I was obliged to constrain them," would give an excellent thought, but is linguistically incorrect. The view of many moderns [even Orelli, p. 381], in accordance with the ἠμέλησα of the LXX, and making בָּעַל = בָּחַל, to despise, to reject, is also untenable. Hengstenberg's explanation, "*but* I betroth them to me," anticipates the following verse.

(7) But, Isa. xl. 25, for *His own sake*, because He must maintain His own glory, He blots out their transgressions and remembers their sins no more.

III. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

§ 203.

The Old Testament Form of Faith.

Meanwhile the just walked in faith and had life therein. The *law*, by always pointing back *to God's electing grace*, and onward to God's just retribution, as the foundation of the righteousness of the law, presupposes *faith*, *i.e.* such a *trusting submission to the covenant God* as was exhibited in *Abraham's* believing adherence to the Divine promise. This is in conformity with that fundamental declaration, Gen. xv. 6, "He believed in the Lord, and He counted it to him for righteousness" (§ 83). Accordingly the requirement of faith runs through the entire Old Testament. The leading of Israel, from the time of its deliverance out of Egypt, Ex. iv. 31, xiv. 31, comp. especially Deut. i. 32, ix. 23, and many other passages, rests entirely on faith. But in proportion as its Divine election seemed to human apprehension thwarted, and the promise of redemption forfeited, by the apostasy of the nation and the judgments thereby incurred, the more emphatically is it asserted how all-important *faith* was, as the root of all righteousness, and the condition on which the blessing was to be obtained.

The thesis of prophetism, Isa. vii. 9, runs thus: "If ye do not believe, truly ye shall not remain [*i.e.* be in a firm and stable condition];" it is the word of the prophet to Ahaz when he sought help from Assyria (§ 181); comp. 2 Chron. xx. 20 (1). *What then is this faith? Negatively speaking, it is a ceasing from all natural confidence in one's own strength and power, a renunciation of all trust in human support and assistance.* Accordingly Jeremiah thus describes unbelief, xvii. 5: "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm" (which was just what Ahaz had done). *Positively*, it is a fastening or leaning; for this is the proper meaning of הֶאֱמִין, namely, a *fastening* [*staying* (Ges.)] *of the heart upon the Divine word of promise, a leaning upon the power and faithfulness of God*, by reason of which He can and will effect what He chooses in spite of all earthly obstacles, and therefore a resting upon the צוּר־לֵבָב, Ps. lxxiii. 26. Compare what is said Ps. cxii. 7 sq. of the just man: נָכוֹן לִבּוֹ בָּטֻחַ בַּיהוָה: סָמוּךְ לִבּוֹ לֹא יִירָא ("His heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord; his heart is established, he shall not be afraid"). On its negative side, whereby faith renounces self-chosen human

ways, it is a *resting in, a quiet waiting for God*, Isa. xxx. 15, comp. with viii. 17, Ps. lxii. 6, and other passages, which resting involves a fearlessness of all the threats of men, Isa. viii. 12, and especially Isa. xxviii. 16 : הַמַּאֲמִין לֹא יָחִישׁ (2). On its positive side, it is a sanctifying of the Lord, viii. 13, a giving of glory to His sole sovereignty, comp. Jer. xiii. 16. If הֶאֱמִין designates faith as the *act* of fastening, or staying the heart, נֶאֱמָן and the *nomen abstractum* אֱמוּנָה (which according to its original meaning, signifies firmness, Ex. xvii. 12) denote the *state* of firmness and constancy of heart in cleaving to God and His promise. So especially in that chief passage, Hab. ii. 4, "the just shall live by his faith," where the faith of the just forms a contrast to the pride and arrogance of the Chaldean, who, according to i. 11, makes his power his God. Hence we find, as already shown (§ 83), that besides adherence to the law as revealing God's commands, a cleaving to the *promise* as revealing God's grace, a patient waiting and hoping for complete redemption, formed an essential feature in the delineation of the servant of Jehovah, the religious and moral ideal of the Old Testament. Compare the other chief passage, Isa. l. 10, where the faith of the Lord's servant is contrasted with the violent conduct of those who depend upon their own efforts, and attempt to save themselves by their own strength (3).

In its expectation of the fulfilment of the Divine promise, the faith of the Old Testament turns to *the future*. It includes *patience* (ὑπομονή) and hope (ἐλπίς) ; קָוָה, Isa. xxv. 9 ; תִּקְוָה, דָּמַם, Ps. lxii. 6 ; חָכָה (waiting), Isa. viii. 15, Hab. ii. 3 ; יָחַל, הוֹחִיל, Ps. xlii. 6, etc. It is according to this specially Old Testament form that πίστις is illustrated by Old Testament examples in Heb. xi. But the Old Testament also exhibits faith as including *negatively that renunciation of one's own claims and merits before God which arises from a conviction of sin, and positively that surrender to the sin-annulling God and His atoning grace* which are essential to the *fides salvifica* of the new covenant. A chief passage in this respect is Ps. cxxx. 3–5 (4). Here faith appears as a *waiting* upon the word which proclaims *forgiveness of sins ;* but here, too, its eye is directed to the future (on which see next §). It is, however, in Deutero-Isaiah that this faith is especially enforced. This book announces, not only the vanity of all human power and strength, declaring that all flesh is grass, and its glory as the flower of the field, and that only the word of God abideth for ever, xl. 6 sqq., but (as also already remarked, § 202) proclaims in a series of passages the nothingness of human merits, the insufficiency of all human performances to attain a righteousness valid in God's sight, and directs men to appropriate God's gracious offers of pardon (5). The word הֶאֱמִין is not, indeed, used for faith in its aspect of an appropriation of pardon, but the act itself is spoken of. The expressions used for it are שׁוּב אֶל, to return, to turn with confidence to, Isa. xliv. 22 (6), or the stronger שׁוּב עַד, Hos. xiv. 2 (7), etc. Also : to seek God (דָּרַשׁ, בָּקַשׁ), Deut. iv. 29 ("with all the heart and with all the soul"), Jer. xxix. 13. This believing self-surrender is further designated as supplication for mercy (תַּחֲנוּנִים), Jer. xxxi. 9 ; and Zechariah especially makes the future conversion of the people to result from God pouring out upon them, xii. 10, the spirit of grace and supplications for grace (רוּחַ חֵן וְתַחֲנוּנִים) (8).

(1) 2 Chron. xx. 20 is almost identical : הַאֲמִינוּ בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְתֵאָמֵנוּ, "Believe in Jehovah your God, so shall ye be established."

(2) Isa. xxviii. 16: "He that believeth must not fear,"—יָחִישׁ denoting anxious restlessness ["shall not make haste," viz. to flee, Ges. ed. Mühlau and Volck].

(3) Isa. l. 10: "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of His servant? let him, when he walketh in darkness and hath no light, trust in the name of the Lord, and stay himself (יִשָּׁעַן) upon his God." On the other hand, it is said with respect to those who (rebelliously) kindle a fire and light up flames, "they are given up a prey to their own fire, they shall lie down in sorrow."

(4) Ps. cxxx. 3–5: "If thou shouldst mark iniquities, . . . who shall stand? but there is forgiveness with Thee. . . . I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait; and in His word do I hope."

(5) Comp. the close of Isa. xliii. (§ 202, with note 7).

(6) Isa. xliv. 22: "I have blotted out as a cloud thy transgressions: . . . return (שׁוּבָה) to me, for I have redeemed thee."

(7) עַד expresses the idea that the movement of turning attains its end.

(8) See more on this subject in the description of the Messianic times, § 223.

§ 204.

The Old Testament Experience of Salvation.

Our next inquiry is, *How far did this appointed way of salvation*, that man laying hold by faith on the grace of God should find forgiveness, *hold good during the Old Testament dispensation?* Are we to say that the just man not only walked in the faith of a future fulfilment of the promise and a future redemption, but also rejoiced in the present possession of salvation, and had an assurance that his sins were pardoned? In other words, *was there already in Old Testament times the experience of justification and adoption in the New Testament sense of these terms?* This difficult question was especially discussed in the *Cocceian disputations*. Cocceius maintaining that the old covenant furnished only a *πάρεσις*, a *praetermissio*, a *dissimulatio* of sin, according to which, although satisfaction had not been made for sin, God did not punish it; but not an *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτίας*, a proper *remissio* (1). In this matter the question is whether, besides the pardon which, as we saw in the doctrine of sacrifice (§ 137), was obtained for *sins of infirmity* by confession and sacrifice (*e.g.* Lev. v. 10: וְנִסְלַח לוֹ, comp. also Ps. xix. 13), there was also pardon for *presumptuous sins*, which could not be atoned for by sacrifice, and therefore a justification of the whole man. To this we reply as follows:—The Old Testament certainly teaches by word and fact—by the latter in the history of the nation as well as in the experience of godly individuals—that Divine forgiveness is imparted to the sinner who turns in penitence and faith to God; and that this is not a mere ignoring of sin, a silence (הֶחֱרִישׁ) on the part of God with respect to it, such as He might for a season observe in the case even of the ungodly (as in Ps. l. 21), but, as Nathan declares to the repentant David, a causing the guilt of sin to pass away (יְהוָה הֶעֱבִיר חַטָּאתְךָ), a removing it to a distance, or, as it is expressed Job xxxiii. 26, He restores unto man his righteousness (וְיָשֶׁב לֶאֱנוֹשׁ צִדְקָתוֹ). It is a replacing the sinner in a state in which, as conforming to the Divine will, he is accepted by God, and becomes an object of the Divine complacency. God desires to be known as gracious and compassionate. "There is forgiveness (הַסְּלִיחָה) with Thee," says the Psalmist, cxxx. 4, "that Thou mayest be feared." *i.e.* that Thou mayest be in Thy forgiving mercy an object of venera-

tion. Forgiveness of sins is an act which God performs for His name's sake, as it is expressed lxxix. 9. Hence the Old Testament speaks not only of the restlessness of him who conceals his sins, or forgives himself, but also of the peace of him who is absolved from sin by the verdict of God. To this subject belong the whole of Ps. xxxii. and Prov. xxviii. 13, with which must be connected the passages in which the mercy of God toward contrite and humble hearts is spoken of, Ps. li., xxxiv., xix., etc. Hence we find not only ascriptions of praise for the future atonement, like Mic. vii. 18 sqq., but also thanksgivings for pardon received, like Ps. ciii.

This experience of salvation, however, still remains but relative, and decidedly differs from that of the New Testament. In the *first place*, it does indeed afford peace of mind concerning individual sins, nay, for the moment, concerning the whole standing of the sinful subject before God; but not resting on an objective and permanent atonement obtained for the church, it does not establish *any permanent state of reconciliation.* That which applies to the church as a whole with respect to the insufficiency of the ministry of reconciliation established in it,—viz. that it was to the future that it must look for a perfect atonement and pardon, comp. Zech. iii. 8 sqq. (2), Ps. cxxx. 7 sq.: "O Israel, wait for the Lord; He *will* redeem Israel from all his sins,"—applies, notwithstanding the inward nature of the expiation, Ps. li. 19, to the individual also. Not such atoning grace and justification were imparted to him as to enable him to say with the apostle: "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." He was *pacified* concerning the past, but only to begin again seeking to be henceforth just through the works of the law. Feelings of love and gratitude to God, who had thus forgiven him, were aroused within him, and he experienced somewhat of the assistance of that Divine Spirit who creates willingness in man. But, *in the second place*, there was not in him, until the ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός appeared in Christ, *an indwelling of this Spirit*, in virtue of which a subversion of the old foundations of his life was effected, and the σπέρμα of a new and spiritual personality, of a spiritual man, implanted in him. This is well expressed by Rougemont (*Christus und seine Zeugen*), when he says that under the Old Testament conversion was indeed reached as a moral change, but not regeneration as a new creation. It is true that spiritual energies were already active within the psychical province; but even the very highest operation of the Divine Spirit in the Old Testament, viz. the gift of prophecy (comp. § 161), continued to be, as we shall soon see, an extraordinary condition, and one which even interfered in a violent manner with the ordinary course of its possessor's life. [What Rougemont may be supposed to mean is, that since the resurrection and ascension of Christ, there is a *fullness* of spiritual power unknown to Old Testament saints. But the *essential elements* of the new birth, repentance, faith, justification, and peace with God must always in their very nature be the same. How difficult it is to draw the line exactly on this question may be seen in the labored attempts of Witsius in the third volume of his *Economy of the Covenants*, Eng. tr. 1763, pp. 1072–1147, in which he endeavors to refute the views of Cocceius. The subject is worthy of a special study and a separate treatise.—D.]

And it was just because, *in the third place*, the Divine Spirit did not make in the Old Testament saints a new foundation of life,—did not as yet work outward

from within, as the transforming principle of the whole man,—that *the conquest of death and everlasting life were not effected.* The individual might indeed be for the moment raised above death and the grave, comp. Ps. lxxiii. 26, etc. (and this subject will be discussed Part III.), but then death was but concealed under a veil. The deliverance from death connected with the pardon of sin in the Old Testament was only a transitory deliverance, a postponement of temporal death. It was in this sense that Nathan said unto David, 2 Sam. xii. 13, "Thou shalt not die;" in this that Job, the sick man, who had found forgiveness of sins, said, xxxiii. 28, "He has redeemed my soul from going into the pit, and my life shall see the light;" and in this also that the Psalmist exclaimed, ciii. 2 sqq., "Praise the Lord, O my soul, . . . who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; *who redeemeth thy life from the grave;* who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies." And when Habakkuk enounces the proposition, "The just shall live" בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ (comp. § 203), it refers to deliverance and preservation under impending judgments, to what was, *e.g.*, expressed in the words of Jeremiah to Baruch, Jer. xlv. 5: "Thy life will I give thee for a prey" (comp. xxi. 9). It is a temporary deliverance from death but the sentence of death is not cancelled. Hence how differently from Job xxx. 28 sound the thanksgivings of the justified in Rom. viii., when the Spirit of the risen Redeemer is energizing in the redeemed! Hence, too, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews declares, xi. 40, that before the redemption of the New Testament, the fathers of the old covenant were not partakers of the τελείωσις.

From what has been advanced, it may be seen how much was wanting under the Old Testament dispensation to the full restoration of a filial relation toward God. The idea of *Divine sonship* as conferred upon the nation in general (§ 82. 1), and then upon the theocratic king (§ 165, with note 7), nay, as affirmed in a special sense of the *godly* (Ps. lxxiii. 15, דּוֹר בָּנֶיךָ, the race of thy sons), was still but an idea, to be fully realized only in the future. The highest communion between God and man, established by prophecy, does not attain to the eminence of that filial state inaugurated by the New Testament; for which reason Christ declares the greatest of the prophets to be less than the least in His kingdom, Matt. xi. 11.

(1) Information concerning this controversy will be found in Buddeus, in his *Institutio theol. dogmat.* Cocceius was opposed not only by Alting and Leydecker, but also by Witsius, *De œconomia fœderum Dei*, ed. 4, p. 786 sqq. (comp. § 11). Among moderns, comp. especially Fr. v. Rougemont's work, *Le Christ et ses temoins*, which contains a series of pertinent remarks on this subject.

(2) According to Zech. iii. 8 sq., the priesthood pointed only in a type (מוֹפֵת) to the future Redeemer (comp. § 200).

THIRD DIVISION.

OF PROPHECY (1).

FIRST SUBDIVISION.

THE PROPHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS.

§ 205.

Negative Propositions.

Although the *natural gifts* and personal qualifications of one called to the prophetic office formed the individual *presupposition* of his prophetic vocation, and though the ministrations of a prophet were objectively conditioned by the state of affairs, and the testimony of each prophet was connected with all the revealed testimony of his predecessors, still *that which made the prophet a prophet was not his natural gifts nor his own intention, and that which he proclaimed as the prophetic word was not the mere result of instruction received nor the product of his own reflection.*

The older theology certainly erred in too widely severing prophecy from its connection both with the individuality (the moral and intellectual idiosyncrasy) of the prophet, and with the objective historical circumstances in which it had its roots, thus conceiving of the individual prophet as inserted in the age like a *deus ex machina*. It is quite certain, however, that neither personal inclination, nor natural endowment, nor human training could make a prophet, and equally so, that the knowledge obtained by instruction or study was incapable of producing a prophecy. However true it may be that a certain learned education was given in the so-called schools of the prophets (§§ 162 and 174), and while it is certain that the prophets were themselves assiduous students of the law, the history of Israel, and the older prophecies, still the *prophet differs essentially from the later scribes and Rabbins.* It is not his to say, "It is written," or, "Such and such a master teaches," but, "Thus saith Jehovah," or, "The word of Jehovah came to me, saying," etc. (2). The true prophets were not the לִמּוּדִים of a human teacher, but of Jehovah (comp. Isa. l. 4), Hence it is that Amos will not allow himself (vii. 14) to be numbered among the titular prophets of the guild or school. The matter of prophecy is also as *distinct* from aught that could be devised or discovered by reflection, as it is from the results of human learning. So little, indeed, is what the prophet predicts derived from his own heart or intellect, that the characteristic of the *false* prophets is declared to be that they speak that which they have themselves devised. These latter are designated, Ezek. xiii. 2 sq., as prophets out of their own hearts, who follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing; they speak, according to Jer. xxiii. 16, a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of Jehovah; they steal, ver. 30 sq., the word of God from the true prophet; they use their tongues and predict like them. (Of course, in the case of the true prophets, reflection plays its part, but it is exercised upon mat-

ter objectively received.) The prophets strictly distinguished between the word of Jehovah and their own views and desires. Very instructive in this respect is the Book of Habakkuk. In ch. i. he complains, first, of the corruption of the times, then of the tyranny of the secular power which God had made the instrument of His judgments. To these complaints he receives, ch. ii., the Divine answer which furnishes the solution of the enigma, whereupon the subjective emotion of the prophet is poured forth in a song of praise in ch. iii. (3).

(1) The prophetic office and its position in the theocracy were described in the historical section (§ 161 sq.), in which a review of the historical development of the prophethood was also given. Our task now is to treat more particularly of prophecy as the medium of *Divine revelation*. Since, however, the nature of this revelation can only be understood by a just appreciation of the mental condition of the prophet who is its organ, we must now discuss more fully this latter point,—in other words, the question how *the prophetic consciousness is to be defined and explained*,—a question which was a source of controversy even in the earliest ages of the church. The course we propose to take in this matter is, first, to lay down those general propositions concerning which there can be, so far as the authority of plain scriptural statements is deferred to, no disagreement; then to state the chief views which have been held on disputed points, and, by examining these several views, to smooth the way to more particular positive definitions. Hence this divison is divided into two subdivisions, the first of which treats of the Prophetic Consciousness, the second of Prophecy. Comp. especially, with respect to the historical element, my article "Weissagung" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xvii. p. 626 sqq. Bruno Bauer has discussed this point more thoroughly than others. Among the numerous monographs, that of Tholuck (*Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, 1860, ed. ii. 1861) must be specially mentioned. [Also König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des A. T.* 2 Bde, 1882; Küper, *Das Prophetenthum des Alten Bundes*, 1870; Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, 1875, transl. Lond. 1877; Riehm on *Messianic Prophecy*, 1875; Orelli, *Die messianische Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreichs*, 2 Bde. 1882–83; also, among English authors, Davison, *Discourses on Prophecy* (Warburtonian Lecture), 1839; Fairbairn, *Prophecy viewed in respect to its distinctive nature, its special function, and proper interpretation*, 2d ed. 1865; W. Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, 1882, against some of whose positions see Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, 1883, in which also the work of Kuenen is examined; comp. also Fisher, *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, 1883, in which, pp. 314–335, he discusses the argument for Christianity from Prophecy.—D.]

(2) It is not our intention to set up any theory of prophecy apart from Old Testament statements, but to listen to what the prophets themselves tell us.

(3) [König (ii. § 21–23) has discussed at some length and in an instructive manner the declaration of the prophets that their prophecy did not proceed from their own heart. How the neglect of this thought avenges itself may be seen in the treatment of prophetic revelation by Ewald, in which revelation appears predominantly as an achievement of the prophets themselves.]

§ 206.

Positive Propositions.

The prophet, as such, knows himself to be the organ of Divine revelation, in virtue both of a Divine vocation, capable of being known by him as such, and which came to him with irresistible power (1), *and also of his endowment with the enlightening, sanctifying, and strengthening Spirit of God. Accordingly, a prophet knows the objective reality, as the word of God, of that word which he proclaims.*

1. The prophets know nothing of a moment at which the resolution to devote themselves to the prophetic vocation came to maturity, though they do know of one when God called them and appointed them to be prophets, even against their own desire, and by the subjugation of their native timidity. The overwhelming constraint of the Divine call is described by *Amos* in the discourse (iii. 8) in which he vindicates his prophetic work (2). He says that he felt like a shepherd whom the roaring of a lion fills with fear, when the Lord said unto him (vii. 15), as he was following the flock, "Go and prophesy unto my people Israel." *Isaiah*, ch. vi., and *Ezekiel*, ch. i. sq., refer their call to visions, in which the glory of the Lord was manifested to them. But the Book of *Jeremiah* furnishes the most abundant proofs of the certainty the prophets felt concerning their Divine vocation. Jeremiah well knew that the events of his life, from the first moment of his existence, had been ordered with reference to his prophetic vocation (comp. i. 4). This had not, however, the effect of producing in him a resolution to embrace this vocation; for even when the Divine call actually came, he resisted it (ver. 6) on the plea of his youth. He testifies, xx. 7 sqq., that the Lord persuaded and prevailed; he asserts that, amidst the sorrows which his prophetic office brought upon him, he would willingly have restrained the Divine impulse, but was unable to do so; comp. xvii. 16 (3). It was in virtue of the assurance that the call he had received was from God, that he condemned the pretensions of false prophets (ch. xxiii., comp. ch. xxviii. and xxix. 24–32) (4). And as it was not by his own choice that any man was called to be a prophet, so also it is generally true with regard to prophetic revelations, that they could not be forced either by the prophets themselves or by any others. For there were seasons during which God's intercourse with His people by means of prophetic revelations was interrupted, such interruption being among the special tokens of approaching judgment. Thus the word of the Lord is sought in vain, Amos viii. 12; visions are in vain desired of the prophets, Ezek. vii. 26, because they no longer receive them from the Lord, Lam. ii. 9, comp. Ps. lxxiv. 9.

2. That overpowering Divine influence which the prophets experienced, is sometimes quite indefinitely designated as the *hand of God* coming upon them, being strong upon them, falling upon them (comp. such passages as Isa. viii. 11, Jer. xv. 17, Ezek. i. 3, iii. 14, 22, viii. 1, etc.). The medium of the revelation is, however, more particularly said to be the Spirit of God, through whom it is, Zech. vii. 12, that the Lord sends His word by means of the prophets (5). This Spirit proves itself to be Divine, first, by disclosing to the prophets *such knowledge as could come from God alone.* For while it is said to the false prophets, Jer. xxiii. 18, "Who has stood in the council of the Lord, and hath perceived and heard His word?" the saying of Amos, iii. 7, that the Lord does nothing, but He revealeth (uncovereth) His secret to His servants the prophets, applies to the true prophets. Hence he who prophesies is called the man of uncovered eyes, Num. xxiv. 4, and the word of the Lord a thing revealed, Dan. x. 1. To lay all possible stress upon the objectivity of this word, its communication is designated as a giving (Ezek. ii. 8, iii. 3), a putting into the mouth of the prophet (Deut. xviii. 18, Jer. i. 9), etc. But even this putting of God's word into the mouth of any man does not, if it stands alone, constitute a genuine prophet. Even a Balaam, when overpowered by Jehovah, was constrained to prophesy, and a Caiaphas to proclaim

truth against his own will (John xi. 51). But still more, in the second place, does the spirit show itself to be of God to the true prophet upon whom it comes, and whom it fits for his office, by its *sanctifying and strengthening agency*. While God says to the ungodly, Ps. l. 16 sq., "What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth, seeing thou hatest instruction and castest my words behind thee?" while the false prophets show themselves to be deceivers by flattering the sinful lusts of the people (Mic. ii. 11, iii. 5 sqq.), the true prophet can testify of himself, Mic. iii. 8, "I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, and of judgment, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin." On the manner in which the prophetic spirit makes him upon whom it comes another man, compare the remarks, § 161, on 1 Sam. x. 6, 9.

3. It is in virtue of such spiritual experience that the prophet knows that the word put into his mouth will also *prove itself* to bear within it the *power of the living God*. It is nutritious like wheat, while the word of the false prophets is like chaff; it works with irresistible force like fire, and like a hammer that breaks the rocks in pieces, Jer. xxiii. 28; it is a word which proves its reality under all circumstances; it shall not return to the Lord void, but shall accomplish that which He pleases, and prosper in the thing whereto He sends it, Isa. lv. 11. Hence the prophet, as the announcer of this word, is also the performer of Divine *acts;* he is, as was said to Jeremiah, i. 10, set over nations and kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant (6).

(1) [König (i. p. 100) says of this statement, that the author means by this call only an impulse of the human spirit communicated by the Divine Spirit. But this is an interpretation which is not sustained by what follows, to which König appeals. When, for instance, it is said that the calling was often made through a vision, something more than such an impulse is recognized.]

(2) Amos iii. 8: "The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophecy?"

(3) Jer. xvii. 16: "I did not withhold myself from following Thee as my shepherd. I have not desired the woeful day (which I was obliged to predict); Thou knowest it: that which came out of my lips was before Thy face."

(4) [If, on the contrary, the false prophets are regarded "as essentially representatives of divergent prophetic tendencies" (Stade, in his *Zeitschrift*, 1881, p. 8), then what the [true] prophet declares in virtue of authority from God in holy zeal against them, must appear to be inspired by carnal passion and partisan zeal.]

(5) [That revelation (revealed truth, in distinction from inspiration) is given by means of the Spirit of God is denied by König, i. p. 104 sqq., who maintains that the endowment of the prophets with the Spirit—which he conceives of, as permanent, but sometimes, for the time being, elevated to an uncommon degree (p. 121), effected "a general excitement, quickening and strengthening of all the faculties," "illumination of the world of ideas, strengthening of memory, sharpening of the judgment, warming of the emotions, energizing of the will" (p. 112)—and also imparted in an ethical aspect "a general disposition to aim at what is pleasing to God" (p. 113). The spiritual endowment thereby produced, "so that a stream of the real Divine Spirit which . . . pervades the universe . . . . was sent down upon these men, and exerted upon them a quickening influence of a peculiar nature (p. 125), *only qualified them to receive revelation*" (p. 111). In respect to Zech. vii. 12, König does not regard the passage as co-

ordinate with the older declarations concerning the influence of the Spirit of God in the accomplishment of revelation, but understands it to say that along with Jehovah as the primary point of departure of the revealed word, the Spirit here appears as a second Divine being, through whom the revelation of Jehovah is made (p. 108 f.). The conclusions of König are worthy of consideration, and may prove a stimulus to more thorough investigation and a more satisfactory answer to the question, but they require proof. Can we *e.g.* regard the pouring out of the Spirit in Joel iii. 1 (A. V. ii. 28) only as a preparation for receiving revelation (p. 108), and in Isa. viii. 11, besides the "unusual influence of the Spirit" to which König holds (p. 121), "Jehovah's speaking with a strong hand" to refer, are we to assume a farther Divine speaking not communicated through the Spirit?]

§ 207.

Psychological Definition of the Prophetic State in Ancient Times

From what has been advanced, the mental condition of the prophet may be generally defined as one in which he knows himself to be under a Divine influence entirely distinct from his own subjectivity, and for that very reason finds himself to a certain extent in a *state of passivity*. This is also expressed by the passive form of his title, נָבִיא, and the corresponding verbal designations נִבָּא and הִתְנַבֵּא. [This view cannot now be regarded as tenable, comp. § 161, note 3.—D.] *But how then is the prophetic state to be psychologically and more precisely defined?* On this subject *various opinions were held in ancient times.* The LXX first deserve notice, inasmuch as they translate נִבָּא, נָבִיא, etc., by *προφήτης*, *προφητεύω*; while, on the other hand, they render קֹסֵם, קֶסֶם, קְסָמִים, which in the Old Testament are only used of false prophets and heathen soothsaying, by *μαντεύομαι*, *μάντις*, *μαντεία*. It is highly probable that the Alexandrian translators were influenced in their choice of these expressions by the distinction which existed between them in their *narrower* use. According to this, the *μάντις* was the *ecstatic* utterer of an oracle, the *προφήτης* the *sober-minded* interpreter of the oracle of the former, as Plato states in the chief passage on this subject in the *Timaeus* (ed. Steph. p. 71 sq.) (1). Thus at Delphi, the interpreter of the Pythia, who combined the sounds she gave vent to into a sentence, was called *προφήτης* (Herodot. viii. 36; Plutarch, *de defectu orac.* cap. 51). When, then, the Old Testament Nabhi is designated in the LXX by the name *προφήτης*, he may be said to be chiefly characterized not as a *predicter* (a meaning belonging indeed also to *προφήτης*), but as *one who declares* what the Divine Spirit has imparted to him, to which function it is essential that it should be consciously and intelligently performed.—*Philo's* view of prophecy is at variance with this, and rather harmonizes, in the manner in which it describes the prophetic state, with what Plato (comp. also *Phædrus*, p. 265; *Ion*, p. 534, ed. Steph.) teaches concerning the mantic enthusiasm. It remodels, however, according to Old Testament supernaturalism, the Platonic theory, which regards the divining power of the soul as immanent in virtue of its Divine origin. The prophet is, according to Philo, the interpreter (*ἑρμηνεύς*) of God, who makes him inwardly perceive what he is to speak (*de praem. et. poen.* Mang. ii. p. 417). This Divine inspiration is received by the prophet in a state of *ἔκστασις*, which is said indeed to be distinctly different from the frenzy of madness, but in which self-consciousness is nevertheless entirely in

abeyance (comp. especially in the work, *Quis rerum divin. hæres sit*, the passage i. p. 511) : the νοῦς has departed to give place to the Divine Spirit (for if the Divine light is to rise, the human light must set). It is merely in appearance, says Philo, that the prophet himself speaks : he is in reality passive ; another is making use of his organs of speech to announce His will. How far Philo severed the prophetic revelation from the life of the prophet, and regarded it as introduced therein without any predisposing cause, is shown particularly by the close of the first book *de monarchia* (2). But, on the other hand, Philo recognizes no specific difference between prophecy and the Divine illumination imparted to every sage. In both, the same πνεῦμα is working. The prophetic state is at last nothing more in his view than that intuitive sinking of the *ego* into the Divine which, and therefore prophecy, is possible παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀστείῳ (3).

Philo's view of the ecstatic character of the prophetic state passed over to the *earliest church fathers*. The prophet, says Athenagoras (Πρεσβεία, cap. viii.), spake κατ' ἔκστασιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν, during which the Divine Spirit that moved them used them, as a flute-player does his instrument. In like manner Justin Martyr declares (*Cohort. ad Græcos*, cap. 8), that "men could not by nature nor by their own reflection know things so great and glorious, but only in virtue of the gift which then descended from on high upon these holy ones ; they needed no arts of rhetoric, ... but only to yield themselves up in sincerity to the Divine Spirit, that He, as a Divine plectrum, descending from heaven, and using these righteous men like a cither or lute, might reveal to us the knowledge of Divine and heavenly things." It may indeed be disputed whether such rhetorical expressions are to be understood of ecstasy in the strictest sense of the word,—the *amentia*, as Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 22), from his Montanist point of view, conceives of it. This subject was not discussed more thoroughly until it became, as Tertullian (*id.*) intimates, a matter of dispute between the *Montanists* and the Catholic church fathers. The latter, disgusted with ecstasy as presented to them by the Montanist prophets, declared all *convulsions which repressed the rational consciousness* unworthy of true prophecy, and only fit for the manticism produced by demoniacal powers (4). *Origen*, in particular, most emphatically maintains the tenet that, during the influence of the Holy Spirit experienced by the prophets, the will and judgment remain in their *normal activity*, and that the removal of every obscuration of the understanding is a token that a better spirit is animating the soul (*De princip.* iii. 3, 4, comp. with Hom. vi. on Ezekiel). With this agree the declarations of Epiphanius against the Montanists (*Hær.* xlviii. 2 and 4 sqq.), and of Chrysostom, 29th Homily on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (5). *Jerome*, too, frequently speaks on this subject ; see *Prol. in expos. Jes.* ed. Vallarsius, iv. sec. 3 ; *præf. comm. in Hab.* vi. p. 590, etc. ; *præf. comm. in Nah.* vi. p. 536. Still the polemics of the Fathers, as Tholuck justly remarks (*Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, p. 65), do not deny the existence of *every kind* of ecstasy in the case of the organs of revelation. They could not thus set themselves in opposition to the clear statements of Holy Scripture. They only reject, as a reference to the words of Miltiades in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, Chap. 17, shows, the παράκστασις, the state in which the man falls into the ἀκούσιος μανία, which they find to be, as Jerome especially insists, opposed to the saying of Paul, in 1 Cor. xiv. 32, that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets, who thus have prediction

in their power; but admit that a *θεῖος μετεωρισμός* takes place with the prophets (Origenes, *in Johann.* ii. 1). Or, to use the expressions of Augustine, they reject the ecstasy as *alienatio a mente*, but acknowledge it as *alienatio mentis a sensibus corporis* (6). And this is in effect to regard the prophetic state as extraordinary and temporary. Frail human nature could not, as Jerome in his commentary on Ezekiel, lib. xi. on ch. xxxv. (*vide* p. 415), remarks, endure an uninterrupted state of revelation. In this respect we discern an essential difference between the prophets and Christ, in whom the Spirit abode permanently (7).

(1) Plato says, *id.*: *μαντικὴν ἀφροσύνη θεὸς ἀνθρωπίνῃ δέδωκεν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐννοῦς ἐφάπτεται μαντικῆς ἐνθέου καὶ ἀληθοῦς*, etc.; wherefore the *προφητῶν γένος* is given to the *μάντις* to explain and exhibit what the *μάντις* has spoken in enigmas.

(2) Moses, it is there said (Mang. ii. p. 222), excluded all kinds of heathen manticism; but in order that the innate desire of all men for the knowledge of the future might be satisfied, *ἐπιφανεὶς ἐξαπίναιος προφήτης θεοσόρητος θεσπιεῖ καὶ προφητεύσει, λέγων μὲν οἰκεῖον οὐδέν· οὐδὲ γάρ, εἰ λέγει, δύναται καταλαβεῖν ὁ γε κατεχόμενος ὄντως καὶ ἐνθουσιῶν· ὅσα δὲ ἐνηχεῖται διελεύσεται καθάπερ ὑποβάλλοντος ἑτέρου. ἑρμηνεὶς γάρ εἰσιν οἱ προφῆται θεοῦ καταχρωμένου τοῖς ἐκείνων ὀργάνοις πρὸς δήλωσιν ὧν ἂν ἐθελήσῃ.*

(3) Comp. *Quis. rer. div. hær. s.*, p. 510: *Καὶ παντὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀστεῖῳ ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος προφητείαν μαρτυρεῖ . . . Φαύλῳ δὲ οὐ θέμις ἑρμηνεῖ γενέσθαι θεοῦ, ὥστε κυρίως μοχθηρὸς οὐδεὶς ἐνθουσιᾷ, μόνῳ δὲ σοφῷ ταῦτ' ἐφαρμόττει. ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνος ὀργανον θεοῦ ἐστιν ἠχοῦν, κρουόμενον καὶ πληττόμενον ἀοράτως ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Πάντας γοῦν ὁπόσους ἀνέγραψε δικαίους, κατεχομένους καὶ προφητεύοντας εἰσήγαγε.* Comp. also, *de creat. principum*, ii. p. 368. The prophet, says Philo, has within him a spiritual sun for the clear perception of that which is invisible to the senses, but comprehensible to the intellect.

(4) The Clementine Homilies, however, in which this contrast first appears, go so far (iii. 12 sqq.) as to reject every transient state of inspiration, and say that this is the case with those only who are cast into a state of enthusiastic frenzy by the spirit of disorder, while they claim for the true prophet an immanent spiritual principle (*ἔμφυτον καὶ ἀένναον πνεῦμα*).

(5) In the latter passage it is said: *τοῦτο μάντευς ἴδιον, τὸ ἐξεστηκέναι, τὸ ἀνάγκην ὑπομένειν, τὸ ὠθεῖσθαι, τὸ ἔκκεισθαι, τὸ σύρεσθαι ὥσπερ μαινόμενον. Ὁ δὲ προφήτης οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας νηφούσης καὶ σωφρονούσης καταστάσεως, καὶ εἰδὼς ἃ φθέγγεται, φησὶν ἅπαντα· ὥστε καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐκβάσεως κάντεῦθεν γνώριζε τὸν μάντιν καὶ τὸν προφήτην.*

(6) Compare Augustine, *ad Simplicianum*, ii. q. i.; *Enarr.* in Ps. lxviii.: *de Genesi*, xii. 25. In the last-named passage this ecstasy is thus described: *quando penitus avertitur et abripitur animi intentio a sensibus corporis, tunc magis ecstasis dici solet. Tunc omnino, quæcunque sint præsentia corpora, etiam patentibus oculis non videntur, nec ullæ voces prorsus audiuntur: totus animi contuitus aut in corporum imaginibus est per spiritalem, aut in rebus incorporeis, nulla corporis imagine figuratis, per intellectualem visionem.*

(7) Comp. also Lib. x. cap. 33 (p. 394): *si* semper *in prophetis esset sermo Dei et* juge *in pectore eorum haberet hospitium, nunquam tam crebro Ezechiel poneret: et factus est sermo domini ad me dicens.*—The anti-Montanist definitions were also embraced by the church theology of the *subsequent centuries*. Compare, *e.g.*, how Gregory the Great (*Expositio moral.* on Job, ch. xiii.) expresses himself on the subject: *cum aliquid ostenditur vel auditur, si intellectus non tribuitur, prophetia minime est.* Pharaoh, *e.g.*, (Gen. xli.), and Belshazzar (Dan. v.), had visions of things to come, but, being unable to understand them, were no prophets. We first meet with a more thorough discussion of the matter among the *Rabbins of the middle ages*, especially Maimonides, *More Neboch.* ii. 32 sqq. (comp. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi. p. 370). He distinguishes three views on prophecy. According to the first and usual one, God of His own free choice calls prophets without regard to their subjective qualifications, with the sole exception that only a just man can become a prophet. According to the second, the view of the philosophers, prophecy is a certain degree of perfection in the nature of man, depending upon

special talents, but needing to be developed by diligent cultivation. Hence any one possessing the requisite talents may fit himself for a prophet; while, on the other hand, none can become a prophet without cultivation, nor can prophecy appear unexpectedly, as though one might attain to it the night before. Lastly, the third view, which Maimonides designates as that "of our law," agrees with the second in requiring a natural talent for prophecy, and especially those strong imaginative powers which are combined with a particular kind of cerebral organization. Hence, if the imaginative faculty is weakened by human sorrow or weariness, no prophecy can be produced. In this view, likewise, it is admitted that any one possessing the requisite qualifications may fit himself both morally, by the purification of his desires and affections, and intellectually to be a recipient of the gift of prophecy. But it is denied that prophecy can be actually thus produced, as is shown by the example of Baruch, the disciple of Jeremiah; on the contrary, it is God alone who produces it, how and when He will, in the individual thus qualified. The distinction of degrees of prophecy, subsequently adopted by other Rabbins, especially by Abrabanel, is also peculiar to Maimonides. He affirms that there are eleven (ch. xlv.). The two first, which form the preliminary stages of prophecy proper, are the endowment with the Spirit imparted to the judges, and the inspiration by the Holy Ghost bestowed upon the composers of the Hagiographa; this inspiration taking place in the waking state, and in one of full mental activity. On the other hand, the Divine word always comes to the prophets as such through the medium of the dream or vision, by which God exerts an influence upon the imagination and intelligence of the prophet, and fills both with matter which he could not have attained to in an ordinary manner (see especially cap. 38). It was only to Moses that Divine revelation was vouchsafed without the intervention of the imaginative powers. The external agency of the senses ceases during the prophetic state (cap. 41); but Maimonides, far from speaking of a disappearance of the rational self-consciousness, on the contrary emphasizes the intellectual agency of the prophet. (The distinction of the nine degrees of prophecy proper is so unprofitable, that it deserves no further notice.)

§ 208.

Continuation: View of this Subject in the Older Protestant Theology.

The propositions laid down by the Fathers, in opposition to the Montanists, were repeated by *the older Protestant theologians* (1). The occurrence of *ecstasy*, in the sense in which Augustine defined it, was admitted, but it was regarded not as a constituent element of prophecy, but only as a *preparation* of the mind for the reception of revelation. The prevailing theory of inspiration being applied to prophecy, the Protestant theologians assumed, in the case of prophets, *both* an entire passivity in the reception of revelation, and a continued state of rational consciousness, with at most but momentary intermissions (2).

In proportion, however, as the orthodox notion of inspiration became unsettled, more influence over the form of their predictions was of course conceded to the subjectivity of the prophets. This was already done by Crusius in his *Hypomnemata ad theologiam propheticam*, 1764, in which he submits this subject to a thorough investigation. He chiefly insists upon the distinction between the matter of revelation and the form under which it is presented; and with respect to the latter, admits the intervention of the free agency of the organs of revelation, which makes them not *instrumenta Dei passiva*, but *activa*, as *σύνεργοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*. With respect, moreover, to the inspiration of the matter, Crusius distinguishes between *ἀποκάλυψις* in the narrower sense, which produces new knowledge in man either

by a creative act or by a transformation of the knowledge already exsisting, and φωτισμός, the illumination which excites and strengthens the knowledge already existing (p. 93 sq.). The distinction between apostolic and prophetic inspiration is also well brought out by Crusius (p. 94 sq.). The inspiration of the apostles was uninterrupted, and, depending on the continued operation of Christ and of the Holy Spirit in them, made them more like Christ: hence they did not, except in certain cases, like 1 Cor. vii. 10, make use of the formula, "*Thus saith the Lord.*" The repeated use of this formula, on the other hand, by the prophets, shows that the state of inspiration was in their case an extraordinary one. Still, even in Crusius, we meet with no exact psychological analysis of the prophetic state; and such discussions were still more foreign to the theology then becoming prevalent, whether supernaturalistic (3) or rationalistic. In the latter, which at best saw in the prophets only so many rationalists, any inquiry into the nature of the prophetic state was entirely omitted. The visions which the prophets affirmed themselves to have beheld, were either attributed in a general manner to the poetic garb in which they spontaneously clothed prophetic truths, or, if recognized in a certain sense as facts, were referred to a state of violent mental excitement. Prophecy in its stricter signification was regarded as out of the question; so that it was a considerable step in advance when De Wette (in the preface to the first edition of his *Introduction to the Old Testament*) declared, that it was a one-sided proceeding to judge these ancient seers according to the spirit of our times, and not even to admit that they *attempted to prophesy*. He was even so fair as to concede that the prophets had *genuine presentiments* of the future.

The question under our notice received, however, a powerful impetus, when Hengstenberg (*Christology of the O. T.* 1st German ed. p. 293 sqq.) revived in all its rigid one-sidedness the Montanist theory of prophecy (4). For he laid down the proposition (p. 294) that the prophets, when recipients of revelation, were in an extraordinary condition, essentially differing from their usual state—in an ἔκστασις, *in which the intelligent consciousness retreated, and the spontaneity, being suppressed by a powerful operation of the Divine Spirit, was reduced to a state of passivity*. They were then, however, truly exalted to a higher region (p. 297 sq.), because not only the intelligent consciousness but also the lower psychical life retreated, and they were thus fitted to receive, like an unsullied mirror, impressions of Divine truth. In the case of heathen seers, on the other hand, the suppression of the intelligent consciousness was effected by exciting the lower portion of the soul to contend against the higher. (We shall commence our further discussion of this subject by criticising this theory.)

(1) See *e.g.* Carpzov, *Introd. V. T.* p. 36 sq., and on what follows, p. 24.

(2) See also Buddeus, *Institut. theol. dogm.* p. 82, and the almost literally identical remark of Cotta on Gerhard's *Loci*, ii. p. 21; Vitringa, *Typus doctrinæ propheticæ*, p. 18. Witsius, in his treatise *de prophetis et prophetia* (printed in the *Miscell. sacr.* 1), gives a somewhat fuller investigation of the questions involved. He here (cap. 9) opposes those who make prophecy the result of natural disposition, viz. of a very vivid imagination (so especially Spinoza in the *Tract. theol. polit.* p. 98 sqq. ed. Gfrörer), of a melancholy temperament, natural foresight, intellectual penetration, etc., and affirms that the freeness of that Divine grace from which the prophets received their vocation was unrestricted, and least of all confined to elevated minds. The *revelatio prophetica* itself is on the one hand *simplex, solo*

interno spiritus instinctu peracta, on the other *symbolica* (cap. 3, § 1); the latter being occasioned partly by the external senses, partly by the imagination (§ 3). In the latter case, *spiritus animales per voluntatem Dei ita agitantur in cerebro et cerebrum eo modo afficiunt, quo modo externa objecta illud commovissent*, which may take place both in the waking and sleeping states. Ecstasy is reckoned among these, and defined (cap. 4, § 1) as *tanta mentis alienatio, ut cessantibus externorum sensuum functionibus, ipsa eorum quæ in corpore geruntur prorsus ignara, tota vehementibus fixisque cogitationibus occupata sit.*

(3) Supernaturalism occupied itself with Old Testament prophecy chiefly for the sake of making use of the evidence of prophecy in the defence of revelation.

(4) In the 2d ed. iv. p. 396–444 sqq., the earlier view is essentially modified. [See further upon and against Hengstenberg, Riehm, p. 15 sqq., and König, ii. 53 sqq., 83 sqq.]

§ 209.

Continuation: Continuity and Elevation of the Individual Life in the Prophetic State.

In this earlier view maintained by *Hengstenberg*, truth and error are blended. It is true that in prophecy states do occur in which the individual life is subjugated by the power of the Divine Spirit, but it is not true that these *coincide* with the state of prophetic revelation, nay, that they are even essential thereto. The states of ecstasy which took place at the school of the prophets at Ramah, one of which is described 1 Sam. xix. 24 (1), have already been alluded to in the historical section (§ 162). It may be that the designation of the prophets as mad (מְשֻׁגָּעִים), recurring in different passages (2 Kings ix. 11; Hos. ix. 7; Jer. xxix. 26), referred not merely to the matter of their addresses, but to some such state. [But in Jer. xxix. 26, Hab. ix. 7, the word refers to *false* prophets; 2 K. ix. 11 it is used *scoffingly* of true prophets.—D.] (2) Still such phenomena cannot be regarded as *normal* in prophecy, as is shown even by the passages to which Hengstenberg chiefly appeals, and which plainly show that self-consciousness and spontaneity did not disappear during the reception of revelation; that the prophets were indeed at this moment determined objectively by the Divine word which came to them, but by reason of the continuance of their self-consciousness were conscious of this objective *determination*, and were capable of free choice with respect to the Divine call addressed to them. In short, they were in a state of passive receptivity.

Thus *Isaiah*, in his initiatory vision, which he describes ch. vi. (3), is indeed conscious that he is a sinful man; he is also conscious that his iniquity is taken away and his sin purged, and declares himself ready in consequence to undertake the Divine commission. *Jeremiah*, too, in his inaugural vision, ch. i., was conscious of his own nonage and weakness (ver. 6); and if he did not resist the overwhelming pressure of the Divine call, nor refuse to fulfil, even amidst contempt and persecution, the vocation imposed upon him, this yielding on his part, however hard God might have made it for him to kick against the pricks, still rested in its deepest ground upon a moral determination (4). It is true that *Ezekiel*, when he received the vision, ch. i., fell down overpowered by the sight (ver. 28), but in order to receive the revelation he had to stand up again, ii. 1 sqq., and that (ver. 2) in the power of the Spirit who entered into him; and he then, evidently with complete consciousness, received the Divine word. It is true also

that *Daniel* sank down stunned in consequence of a vision (x. 8–10), but he did not receive the revelation till he had recovered himself (comp. also Rev. i. 17). The continuity of self-consciousness presupposes that the remembrance of the revelations they received in these visions remained with the prophets, and that they themselves, and not others, described what they had seen (so *e.g.* Zech. i. sqq.). It is this circumstance, to mention it in passing, which makes so decided a distinction between prophecy and those psychical phenomena with which it has been so often compared, viz. somnambulism and the higher grades of mantic ecstasy, such *e.g.* as still occur in Shamanism (5), when there is upon awaking *no remembrance* of what has been uttered. Besides, whatever harm the visional state may do to the physical life in the case even of true prophets, as Daniel *e.g.* says, viii. 27, that he was sick several days in consequence of a vision, this cannot be designated as a *suppression* of the individual life. On the contrary, the prophet felt himself inwardly *elevated*. *Isaiah* (ch. viii. 11 sqq.), when under the pressure of the Divine hand (חֻזְקַת הַיָּד, by which the visional state is intended), knew himself to be under Divine instruction, which no longer suffered him to walk in the way of the multitude; *Jeremiah*, though he feared, naturally speaking, to fail before his enemies, yet knew that he should prevail over them all through the power of the Spirit, i. 19, xv. 20, xx. 11; comp. Hab. iii. 19, etc. (6). In thus showing, however, that the individual life is not obliterated but enhanced in the prophetic state, we have still left the question, *what the psychical form of prophecy properly is*, without an answer.

(1) According to 1 Sam. xix. 24, Saul, when seized by the spirit of prophecy in the school of the prophets, stripped off his clothes also (גַּם הוּא, therefore like the prophets), and prophesied, and lay down naked all that day and all that night, —a circumstance which recalls to mind the Delphian Pythia, who in her ecstasy stripped herself of her garments. [עָרֹם *naked:* (*a*) scantily clothed, Job xxii. 6, xxiv. 7, 10, Isa. lviii. 7; (*b*) of one who lays aside his outer garment, and has on only the tunic, 1 Sam. xix. 24, Isa. xx. 2 (Mühlau and Volck's Gesenius).—D.]

(2) This climax of the ecstatic state, in which self-consciousness disappears, seems to belong especially to the older times of the prophethood (§ 162, with note 2.)

(3) [The assertion of Duhm (p. 86), that this vision was used long after by the prophet for the clothing of new prophetic ideas, and therefore cannot be used in evidence of the prophetic state, is without foundation.]

(4) Thus too Amos, who lays such special stress upon the Divine initiative, refers the prophetic vocation, iii. 3, to an agreement between God and the prophet.

(5) We are acquainted with the latter especially from the travels of Herr. v. Matjuschkin; comp. *e.g.* Tholuck, *id.* p. 8 sqq.

(6) According to Hab. iii. 19, the prophet walks triumphantly upon the high places on which God has placed him. Comp. also 1 Sam. x. 6, 9, and what was stated, § 161, on the ethical influence of the prophetic spirit.

§ 210.

Continuation: Prophecy an Inward Intuition.

Those who endeavor to explain the prophetic state on *natural* and psychological grounds, are accustomed to regard it as produced by a considerable excitement and exaltation of the *emotions*. This is so far correct, that this state is *pre-*

ceded by one of strong excitement of the feelings; nay, that the latter may often be *intentionally produced* as a preparation for the former, for which purpose music is especially employed, see 2 Kings iii. 15. To this may also be referred the circumstance alluded to by Hengstenberg (*Christology*, iv. p. 400), that the prophets sometimes (comp. Ezek. i. 3, Dan. x. 4) received their visions by the sides of rivers, because the murmur of the waters could not but assist in producing in them the desired state of mind. But that feeling constitutes the *essential form* of the prophetic state, is refuted, as Bruno Bauer justly remarks (*Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, ii. p. 306), by the fact that in feeling, the matter felt is not yet separated from the subjective spirit, while the matter upon which the prophetic spirit operates is *objectively* given *outside itself*. Undoubtedly the prophets were often in a state of excited feeling at the times when they uttered their predictions, and did not, as merely mechanical instruments of the inspiring Spirit, comport themselves in an utterly indifferent manner with respect to their prophecies. They were stirred by fear and hope, filled with sorrow and joy, and this as intensely as if the matter they predicted were the subject of their own experience. But that in such cases the frame of mind was of *secondary importance*, that it was produced by the objective influence of the Divine Spirit, is evident especially from the circumstance that the feeling natural to the prophet was frequently *exchanged* for just its opposite. Thus the emotion natural to a prophet when announcing judgments against the enemies of his country is evidently that of joy. Nevertheless passages are found in which the prophet is so carried away by his own vivid realization of the woes which he announces, as to be full of sorrow and lamentation. Comp. the prophecy concerning Moab, Isa. xvi. 9–11, and that concerning Babylon, xxi. 1–10, where this state of mind is very distinctly portrayed. In the vision, which is described ver. 2 as a grievous one, the prophet beholds the Medo-Persian hosts advancing against Babylon, and is immediately transported into the night in which Babylon is overthrown. His natural feeling as an Israelite would have been one of joy at the deliverance of his people, to whose sorrows an end was thus appointed; yet the revelation he has received has so overpowering an effect upon his feelings, that he feels the sorrows about to fall upon Babylon just as though they were his own, ver. 3 sq. (1).—On the other hand, the feeling natural to the prophet must exercise no influence upon his predictions; comp. *e.g.* Jer. xvii. 16 (§ 206, note 2). Even when the prophet knows himself to be the herald of the Divine wrath, even such a message from God must be relished by him, see Ezek. iii. 1 sqq. compared with ii. 10, iii. 14, Rev. x. 9 sq., and be received with joy and delight, Jer. xv. 16.

The psychical form of prophecy is rather that of an *inward intuition*, taking the word in its wider signification. It belongs to this intuition that the subject is aware that the object is directly given, and not produced by his own agency; and this is just what the prophets affirm with respect to their prophecies. Hence the prophets designate themselves as *seers*, רֹאֶה, which, according to 1 Sam. ix. 9, was the former customary appellation of prophets, and more frequently חוֹזֶה. See Isa. xxx. 10, and many other passages, especially in the Books of Chronicles. Often as the attempt has been made, no decided difference can be shown between the expressions רֹאֶה and חוֹזֶה, so far as they are used to designate the prophetic perception (2). חָזוֹן, which in Hebrew (though not in Chaldee) belongs rather

to poetic diction, is used as a somewhat more solemn expression; for the prophetic seeing (as something extraordinary), חָזוּת, חִזָּיוֹן, and especially, חָזוֹן, are the frequently recurring appellations of the revelations imparted to the prophets. Sometimes this inward perception of the prophets is also styled a *hearing*, *e.g.* Num. xxiv. 4, 16, Isa. xxi. 10 (3), xxviii. 22, with which compare also v. 9, xxii. 14. In l. 4, on the contrary, the words, "He wakeneth morning by morning, He wakeneth mine ear to hear as the instructed" (*i. e.* takes me to His school), refer not so much to the reception of revealed knowledge as to the Lord's supplying His servant with grace to walk with patient obedience in the path prescribed to him. The prophets, however, chiefly choose the expression *to see*, even when it is a mere form of speech, for the manner in which they became directly conscious of the God-given matter (4); see *e.g.* Amos i. 1 (5), Isa. ii. 1, Hab. i. 1, and especially ii. 1 (see below). There is also a reference to this form of prophecy in the designations of מְרַגְּלִים, צֹפִים, *i.e.* spies, שֹׁמְרִים, watchmen, though the latter name has also a wider signification (§ 162). As the watchman upon the tower keeps a look-out for anything that may appear in the distance, and when he sees danger approaching sounds his horn, so do the prophets behold events dawning upon the distant horizon of time, that by announcing them they may warn or comfort the people, who are ignorant of the future; see Jer. vi. 17 (6), Amos iii. 6, Isa. lii. 8, Ezek. xxxiii. 2 sqq. Hence, too, they are called, Isa. xxix. 10, the eyes of the people. Specially instructive in this respect is the passage Hab. ii. 1. The prophet's mind is agitated by the conflict with doubt, he is longing for light upon the enigmas of time, and exclaims: "I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what He will say within me, and what I shall bring back upon my reproof." This passage may be taken literally (as by Hitzig), viz. as saying that the prophet sought a solitary place, where, directing his glance toward heaven and his collected spirit to God, he looked for revelation. Probably, however, this prophetic saying is to be *spiritually* understood, as is indispensably necessary in the similar passage, Isa. xxi. 6, 8. The latter pasage is also worthy of note, on account of the distinction it makes between the seeing spirit of the prophet and his ordinary subjectivity. For he sets another as watchman upon the tower, to declare what the Lord causes him to see, and what is to be announced to the people. In ver. 11 sq. of the same chapter, on the other hand, the prophet himself reappears as watchman.

What now the prophet perceives is a דְּבַר יְהוָה (word of Jehovah), a נְאֻם יְהוָה (which expression represents the mysterious nature of the inwardly perceived Divine voice), a מַשָּׂא (a lofty or eminent saying) (7), etc. Such *words* of revelation fall, according to what was remarked above, under the notion of the חָזוֹן in its wider sense. When, however, the image awakened by the revelation appears in a plastic form before the mind of the prophet, a *vision* in the stricter sense takes place, and this is of a symbolical character, the matter of the prophecy being reflected in the imagination of the prophet (8). With respect to *visional symbolism*, there is a remarkable difference between individual prophets. In some, especially the more ancient, it is simple, and therefore for the most part easily understood, *e.g.* the visions of Amos, ch. vii. sqq. (9). In Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Daniel, on the contrary, the symbolism is more complicated; and cases occur in which the prophet himself does not understand the images he beholds, and requests an explanation

of them (Zech. iv. 4, Dan. viii. 15). The prophets are, moreover, frequently required to express the substance of the Divine messages by symbolical *actions*. In many of these cases, however (especially in Ezekiel), it may be questioned whether the action really took place externally, as *e.g.* Isa. xx. 2, or whether it belongs merely to the vision (10) (11).

(1) Isa. xxi. 3 sq. : "My loins are filled with pain : pangs have taken hold of me, as the pangs of a woman that travaileth : I was bowed at the hearing of it ; I was dismayed at the saying of it : my heart panted, fearfulness affrighted me : the night of my pleasures hath He turned into fear to me."

(2) [The distinction stated by Vitringa, that רָאָה is the more general expression, and that חָזָה expresses more the ecstatic gazing, cannot be sustained. Orelli (p. 6 sqq.) remarks : The distinction between these two words is that the former indicates the relation of the eye to an object it sees, the latter the fixing of the gaze upon the form of the object, and hence upon an image. They are accordingly related to each other like our "see" and "gaze."—The relation of the two words has been discussed at some length by König (ii. 29 sqq). He observes that the true prophets refuse to recognize "seeing" (רָאָה), but not "gazing" (חָזָה) on the part of the false prophets, while conversely they never employ the latter term in speaking of themselves—which last position is tenable only by regarding Isa. xxx. 10 as a later gloss, or by understanding חֹזִים to refer to other persons than the רֹאִים in the same verse, and also by considering superscriptions like Isa. i. 1, ii. 1 not to have been written by the prophet himself. König comes to the conclusion that רָאָה in contrast with חָזָה can only mean a *literal* seeing (with the bodily eye), while the latter word is used, in regard to the false prophets, to indicate an interior process, and characterizes their declarations as something projected from the interior of man outward.]

(3) Isa. xxi. 10 : "That which I have heard of the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, have I declared unto you."

(4) Which Augustine, *de Genesi*, xii. 25, calls in the above-quoted passage the *intellectualis visio*, in distinction from the *spiritualis*.

(5) Amos i. 1 : "The words of Amos, . . . which he *saw*."

(6) Jer. vi. 17 : "I have set watchmen over you, Hearken to the sound of the trumpet."

(7) It is quite a mistake, and by no means follows from the play upon the word, Jer. xxiii. 33 sqq., to say that the word מַשָּׂא in the titles of the prophecies means, as Hengstenberg tries to prove (*Christology*, iii. p. 380), "burden," and introduces only threatening addresses. [Comp. also Keil on Nahum i. 1 and Jer. xxiii. 33.] The passage Lam. ii. 14, where the sayings of the false prophets who flattered the people are called מַשָּׂאוֹת שָׁוְא, is decisive against this view, notwithstanding the turn which Hengstenberg manages to give it. There is in the expression מַשָּׂא (properly that which is raised above) a certain emphasis, and this circumstance explains why it is so often applied to addresses which pronounce penalties.

(8) There is, as Tholuck justly remarks (*id.* p. 54), no distinction of degree and time between the two forms of revelation, viz. those by word and image ; it is rather the psychical state of the individual prophet which here seems to exert its influence. [König doubts the part here assigned to the imagination in visions (see ii. p. 125), and says, among other things, if thinking and imagination had been used as means of information, the prophets could not have been convinced of the objective reality of what took place : they could not have been sure of their calling if made in a vision.—But the objectivity of a revelation is not dependent upon the reality of the images seen, but upon the fact that God presents them to the prophet's sight.]

(9) Amos vii., the devouring locusts and the consuming fire as images of the Divine judgments, the plumb-line laid to the wall as symbolical of the dealings of the

Divine justice; ch. viii., the basket of ripe fruit as an image of the nation ripe for judgment.

(10) There is scarcely a point in prophetic theology concerning which theologians so greatly differ. Comp. the marriage of Hosea, which Hengstenberg affirms to be a purely visional occurrence. No general principle can be laid down by which to determine how far such actions pertain to the province of the external or the internal. (Comp. Tholuck, *id.* p. 60; Bleek, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, ii. p. 18.

(11) [In opposition to the view of revelation as communicated by *internal* gazing or perception, König takes the position that it is rather by means of the external organs, the eyes and ears (comp. ii. § 15 sqq.). The immediate sight of the Deity which appears in Num. xii. 6–8 as the special pre-eminence of Moses, he regards not as contrasting him with the prophet of the Scriptures, but only with "mediate" prophets. "I assume that the ordinarily invisible background of the universe was really opened to the bodily eye (under certain circumstances specially sharpened) of the prophet, that *e.g.* the chariot of God was really shown to Ezekiel" (ii. 128). But this inevitably involves the conclusion that an objective reality must be attributed to the chariot. Can König admit this? And how will he explain the visions in which not "the invisible background of the universe," but what pertains to the visible universe is seen, as in Am. viii. 2, Jer. i. 11 sq., 13 sq.? What sort of basket of figs was it which Amos saw, and what kind of an almond rod and boiling pot did Jeremiah behold with the bodily eyes?]

§ 211.

The Prophetic State illustrated by Analogies in the Ordinary Life of the Spirit: Dreams, Communion with God in Prayer.

If we seek from *analogous occurrences in the ordinary life of the human spirit*, to cast some light on the nature of prophetic sight or perception, the first which seems to offer itself for comparison is the vivid *dream*, in which the self-consciousness which had withdrawn during sleep again dawns and thus fastens in the memory the images seen in the dreams. That the Old Testament does not exclude the dream (1) as a medium of revelation, was shown § 66, where, however, it was also remarked that the Old Testament speaks of dream-revelations almost solely in the cases of such as were not, strictly speaking, organs of revelation. In Jer. xxiii. 25, comp. with Deut. xiii. 2 sqq., and Zech. x. 2 sqq., it is laid down as a token of the false prophets that they *chiefly* appealed to dreams; and Jeremiah opposes to these the revelations imparted to himself, xxiii. 28 (see § 66, note 3). Hence it is all the less probable that in the difficult and obscure passage xxxi. 26 he is himself, as many suppose, referring to a revelation by means of a dream. Nor are the night visions of Zechariah, ch. i.–vi., to be regarded as ordinary dreams. Ch. iv. 1, which tells us that the prophet *was awakened* for the reception of the vision (2), shows that his visional state was not one of dreaming. In Daniel (vii. 1), the revelation advances from the dream to the higher vision. The reason why only a subordinate importance is attributed to dreams, is easy to perceive. Although sleep, by reason of its withdrawal of a man from the external world, seems specially favorable for the intercourse of the Divine with the human spirit; still, on the other hand, a man in this condition is not *duly capable of distinguishing* between what proceeds from his own heart (חָזוֹן לִבּ, Jer. xxiii. 16) and Divine inspiration. The Divine word, on the contrary,

must come to the prophets in such a manner as to leave them in no kind of doubt that it is such. It is true that among the conditions with which the *vision* is combined there is found also a *sleep*, which outwardly appears to be a state of deep insensibility, תַּרְדֵּמָה, נִרְדָּם, Dan. viii. 18, x. 9. The seer sinks down, his external eyes closed, while his internal eyes are opened, Num. xxiv. 4, 15. The visional state is sometimes enhanced even to rapture, Ezek. viii. 1–3, xi. 1. There is a rapture described by Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 2–4, which, to use the words of Delitzsch (*Biblical Psychology*, p. 336), touches the boundaries of life and death, *i.e.* of the separation of soul and body (3). But *in far the greater number of cases* we must evidently conceive of the state in which the prophet receives a revelation as merely one of *profound self-introversion and collectedness of mind in a state of perfect wakefulness*. This prophetic state is most nearly related to *communion with God in prayer*. It should be carefully noted that the same expression which is generally used in the Old Testament for the hearing of prayer, viz. that God *answers*, עָנָה, is also frequently applied to prophetic revelation (*e.g.* in Mic. iii. 7, Hab. ii. 1 sq., Jer. xxiii. 35, and other passages). When suddenly, at once, and with full certainty, the conviction of the Divine audience enters the soul of the petitioner as an inwardly perceived answer (4), such a conviction is entirely analogous to the manner in which the word of God came to the prophets; and hence we find that many supplicatory psalms conclude in a strain quite prophetic. And as the Divine answer presupposes a request on the part of the petitioner, so also do we find the prophets in certain cases bringing before God in prayer the matters concerning which they desire Divine revelation (Jer. xxxii. 16, xlii. 4, Hab. i., Dan. ix. 4 sqq.); nay, in Jer. xxxiii. 2, *calling* upon God is the presupposed condition of obtaining revelation: "*Call unto* me, and I will answer thee, and show thee great and hidden things which thou knowest not" (5).—This point is particularly fitted to bring to light the *ethical* character of the prophet's relation to God. It is true that the God whose Spirit so pervades all things that every word uttered by a human tongue is before Him (Ps. cxxxix. 4, 7), may, according to Holy Scripture, constrain even a Balaam to predict blessings to Israel, reveal the future in dreams to a Nebuchadnezzar, employ (Ezek. xxi. 26 sq.) even forms of heathen manticism for His own purposes, and so direct the words of a Caiaphas, John xi. 51, as to make him prophesy without his own knowledge or will. But certain as it is that there is, as the examples just adduced show, a Divine influence in virtue of which a man must either say what he desires not to say, or voluntarily utter that to which a Divine meaning neither known nor intended by himself is imparted, still this does not justify us in ignoring the subjective factor in revelation furnished by the true prophets. For in the case of these organs of Divine revelation, properly so called, their self-surrender and their own acquiescence in the Divine counsels of which they were to be the messengers (6) corresponded, as has been already remarked (§ 209), with the Divine choice and calling. Thus there arose an understanding, a mutual intercourse between God and the prophet, in which the latter gave his whole being, with its special qualifications, to the fulfilment of his office, and lived his whole life with reference thereto. Whatever the prophet learned, experienced, or observed, all that he feared or hoped, all concerning which he needed counsel or information, nay, even the external events which concerned him personally, see *e.g.* Hos. i., Ezek.

xxiv. 18 sqq., all offered so many *points of connection* by which the Divine word might reach him, and that word clothed itself in forms which had a relation to the idiosyncrasy and experience of the prophet, and was reported by him according to his individual rhetorical or literary powers (7). This word of God was, however, *by no means produced*, from the matter of the prophet's own mind (whether viewed ethically or intellectually). "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven," is the testimony of the greatest of the prophets (John iii. 27). As an answer to prayer cannot be manufactured, but depends upon whether God will permit Himself to be found or not (Isa. lv. 6, Ps. xxxii. 6, etc.), and there are even seasons when heaven seems closed against the wrestling in prayer of God's servants, so a prophet might prepare himself for the reception of a revelation, but could neither extort it nor prescribe its matter. Accordingly we find that the prophets often had to wait till they received the Divine communications, see Isa. xxi. 8, Jer. xlii. 7 in its connection with ver. 4; and that there were times (as remarked, § 206) in which such communications entirely ceased.—The last-named point furnishes also a proof of the untenableness of the *naturalistic explanation* of the prophetic state. The physiologist Hecker (*Ueber Visionen*, 1848, p. 11, 13) thinks, for instance, that any vivid conception, whether true or imaginary, may, by reason of continued nervous excitement, be transformed into a vision so soon as it has attained the requisite fervor, and that it is in this way that the sublimest ideas have been incorporated in the religions of all nations. The answer is, that there was no lack either of sublime ideas or "fervor" in the days described Lam. ii. 9, Ps. lxxiv. 9, etc., and in the times of the Maccabees (comp. § 192), and yet prophecy was then silent (8).

(1) Prophetic significance was also, in all heathen antiquity, attributed to dreams, upon the assumption that when the voluntary self-determination of man ceases, the Divine influence begins to operate upon his soul. If, during sleep, when that by which the inner life of man is governed and determined acts most unrestrainedly, the communion of the saints with God takes place in full efficacy (comp. especially Ps. xvi. 7), the soul will also, when in this condition, be in a state of special recipiency for the influence of the Divine Spirit (Job xxxiii. 14 sqq.). [In Ps. xvi. 7, the phrase "in the night seasons" refers more probably to the night as favorable for quiet thought, rather than to sleep.—D.]

(2) Zech. iv. 1: "As a man that is wakened out of his sleep." "The weakness of human nature," says Hengstenberg in his just remarks on this passage (*Christology*, iii. p. 335), "had asserted in his case its incapacity to maintain for any lengthened period the contemplation of the super-sensuous" (comp. Luke ix. 32). [Comp. on the question whether the prophets received revelation in dreams, König, ii. 9 sqq., whose conclusions agree with the position taken in the text. Jer. xxi. 26, he understands as saying that Jeremiah received a divine communication in his sleep, but not in a dream (p. 13–15). In Zech. iv. 1 he properly lays emphasis upon the fact that the prophet was wakened, not when he was asleep, but *as* one who slept—*i.e.* from a state of passivity, of weakness and exhaustion.]

(3) A comparison of such visions with the phenomena of magnetic somnambulism is obvious; but the greater the external resemblance, the less must the essential difference between them, already alluded to § 209, be overlooked, viz. that the self-consciousness of the prophet is *never lost* in the vision; and that by virtue of this continuity of self-consciousness, the state of revelation enters into *active connection with the ordinary mental state of* the prophet, and exercises a decided and lasting influence thereon. Comp. Ennemoser, *Der Magnetismus im Verhältniss zur*

Natur und Religion, pp. 91 and 241. In the latter passage the results of the comparison of prophetic with other psychical phenomena are summed up in the words, "Divine prophetic inspiration, from whatever point of view it may be critically regarded, is a unique phenomenon." Visions of the higher grade are, moreover, by no means frequent in the Old Testament.

(4) Comp. *e.g.* Ps. xx. 6: "Now *know I* that the Lord saveth His anointed."

(5) [The protest of König (ii. 197 sqq.) against the analogy here presented, rests partly upon his erroneous conception that an analogy between certain experiences of the prophets and those of praying believers places them *on a level*, and partly upon a different view of the latter. For he maintains (p. 200 sq.) that "the so-called certainty that a prayer is heard is only the exhaustion of the soul in prayer, the inference that the full offering of humility and trust cannot fail of its influence upon God" . . . "If one who prays ever holds any other view, we must charge him with religious aberration." The strained supernaturalism of König here gives way, for the sake of favoring his view of the prophetic state as unique, to a rationalizing mode of thought. Comp., on the other hand, Riehm, p. 26 sq.]

(6) The *ethical element* in prophecy is maintained, though with one-sided prominence, against Hengstenberg and Hofmann by Düsterdieck, *De rei propheticæ in V. T. quum universæ tum messianæ natura ethica*, 1852.

(7) [König (ii. 208) maintains that these specifications go beyond the limits of the prophet's consciousness, and attribute to their individuality a positive concurrence in the act of revelation, which they themselves do not claim. But is there not in 1 Sam. iii. 10, and in Isa. vi. 8, a self-dedication to the revealing God, without any positive concurrence in the act of revelation? Even if, with König and Hitzig-Steiner, we understand Am. iii. 3 as only an illustration of the thought that there is no effect without a cause, and so do away with the evidence, from this passage, of the ethical relation of the prophet to God, yet this relation is certainly proved by a series of other prophetical testimonies, some of which are given in the text.]

(8) The *last days of Jerusalem*, before its destruction by the Romans, well showed what kind of prophets *natural fervor* is capable of breeding, § 192, note 10. It is only by acknowledging revelation as a spontaneous and actual relation into which God has entered with the world, that such revelationless periods can be possibly understood.

§ 212.

Continuation: The Conceptions of Genius and the Natural Powers of Divination (1).

In explaining Old Testament prophecy, the attempt has often been made to refer it to *prophetic powers inherent in the human mind*, and manifesting themselves also in the *conceptions of genius*, whether of the poet, the artist, the hero, etc., when—"at one time after long reflection and by gradual development, at another at once and apparently without preparation—some great thought comes before his soul with such vividness and power that in this moment of conception his creative mind already bears within it, in its fully completed state, the work on which he may perhaps still have to labor for years." (It is thus that E. Graf expresses himself concerning the several revelations of God, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1859, No. 2, p. 272. Comp. also Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, 1st ed. p. 71, 2d ed. p. 70.) In particular has a *divining power*, inherent in the human mind, and producing actual prophecy *outside* the province of scriptural revelation, been spoken of. This has been done especially by E. v. Lasaulx, in his work *Die prophetische Kraft der menschlichen Seele in Dichtern und Denkern*, 1858 (2); while Hamann had already ventured to declare, "We are all capable of being prophets."

For this theory a certain amount of truth must be acknowledged, even from a scriptural standpoint; for the Old Testament (as was shown, § 65) refers all intellectual endowment to a Divine spiritual influence on the mind. Still that *personal and familiar relation* in which the prophet stands to God, which makes him a participator of the Divine counsel, and discloses to him secret things, Amos iii. 7, Jer. xxiii. 18, etc. (comp. § 161), stands out as *something specific* amid these general spiritual influences (3). With regard to so-called natural divination, in particular, the aspect in which this may most allowably be compared with scriptural prophecy is, that it is the *prophecy of conscience* (4). For since the God who gives testimony to Himself in the conscience, and who pledges to it a holy and righteous government of the world, and thus sharpens in every morally susceptible man a perception of the providential leading whether of individuals or nations, is the same Being who reveals in prophecy the laws of His moral government, the two must necessarily coincide with each other in essentials (5). But does this natural divination know anything positively respecting the purposes of God's ways upon earth? Lasaulx may call Scipio's allusion, amid the ruins of Carthage, to the future fall of Rome, in the words of Homer (*Iliad*, IV. v. 164 sq.), "a genuine prophecy;" but the prophets of the Old Testament knew *something more*, when they proclaimed that above the ruins of all earthly power the glory of the God of Israel should flow like the waves of the sea (Hab. ii. 13 sq.), when they beheld from their corner of the world the kingdom of God coming to all nations, and when Daniel declared (ch. vii.) that the kingdom of the Son of man from heaven should triumph over all those secular powers which should successively emerge from the storm-tossed ocean of the nations (6). Besides, how does the prophecy of conscience manage the enigmas given it to solve, by those contradictions of its postulates which are presented by the course of the world? (7). And when Lasaulx, in attempting to explain the prophecy of the Old Testament, further suggests the sympathetic connection of the individual human spirit with the national spirit and that of all mankind, we fully concede that a nation may produce individuals in whom the presentiments of the national spirit may be transfigured into lucid thoughts, and, under certain circumstances, be even clearly expressed in prophetic sayings; but it is equally certain that the prophets of the Old Testament *laid no claim* to this honor. They knew that the Spirit by which they were inspired *was not the natural spirit of their nation;* that their predictions were not the expression of popular expectations. The power of Old Testament prophecy was so far from being conditioned upon the secular prosperity of the nation, that it was, on the contrary, in proportion as the external glory of Israel decayed that prophecy unfurled her wings and proclaimed upon the grave of Israel's earthly hopes the triumph of the eternal kingdom of God (8). The prophets knew that the thoughts of God, of which they were the interpreters, are as high above the thoughts of man as heaven is higher than earth, Isa. lv. 8 sq. (9).

This transcendence of revelation extends so far as to become a *limitation* of prophecy: for, as the Old Testament knows nothing of any permanent *indwelling* of the Spirit of revelation in the prophets, but speaks only of a falling (Ezek. xi. 5), a coming (1 Sam. x. 6) of the Spirit *upon* or *over* them; so the matter of revelation, though their free agency is manifested in the form in which they present it,

is not, strictly speaking, the mental *property* of the prophets, but continues to be a thing *imparted*. Hence its meaning was not fully grasped by their understanding, but was, as St. Peter tells us, 1 Pet. i. 10, a matter of investigation to themselves (10). This accounts also for the impression, so often received by the attentive reader from the prophetic word, that it reaches further than its inadequate form, and bears within it, according to the intention of the Spirit, that which far surpasses the individual consciousness of the prophet (11) (12).

(1) Comp. *Ueber das Verhältniss der A. T. Prophetie zur heidnischen Mantik* (accompanying the congratulatory address of the University of Tübingen to the University of Breslau, 1861).

(2) The conclusion of this work is embraced in the following propositions: "If there is present in every human soul somewhat of the collective powers of the soul of his nation and of the soul of all mankind, nay, of the soul of the world; and if, in the matter of prophesying, as in every great matter of human life, the individual soul is immersed in the universal soul, in the great and universal meaning of nature and the world, and is thence born again with renovated powers; it is conceivable that, as the present is as substantially connected with the future as it is with the past, each individual soul may foresee not only its own future, but also that of its nation, nay, of all mankind. From the depths of the soul and from the creative power of God therein arise all great thoughts, all that is new or extraordinary, all that leads mankind toward its eternal destination."

(3) Therefore the prophet knows himself to be taught of God in quite another manner from that in which the artisan Bezaleel, *e.g.*, nay, even Solomon, could declare themselves to be.

(4) Comp. Beck, *Einleitung in das System der Christl. Lehre*, p. 197.

(5) The strength of this natural divination lies in its presentiments of approaching Divine judgments, in its perception that a curse cleaves to all unexpiated guilt, that all power founded on deceit and unrighteousness works its own destruction, and that all earthly glory and greatness is destined to perish.

(6) [König (ii. p. 202) remarks, on the other hand: "This does not appear to me a sufficient answer. Such expectations of a triumph of good on the earth any one who believes in a moral order of the world might have." But, in the first place, a general and indefinite idea of a final triumph of the good is not here attributed to prophecy, but it will be found, on reading a few lines further, that evidence is given that it looked to a much more concrete aim of the course of history; and secondly, we may ask whether faith in a moral order of the world which is sure of such an issue of history, can be or has been formed, except under the influence, directly or indirectly, of revelation. And when König further remarks, "What is decisive in respect to the difference between divination and prophecy, is not the matter, but the form: the prophets did not draw from a fountain which stood at the service of *all*," he does not meet the position taken in the text, the meaning of which is simply this, that the difference in the matter of prophecy points to a different source—in the one case to the human mind, in the other to the Spirit of God. Unless it can be shown to those who place prophecy in the same line with natural divination, that the former is superior in respect to its contents, they will not believe that its declarations have any other than a human source; or they will find a revelation through the Spirit of God in the last degree superfluous, if it offers nothing higher than human auguries and thoughts.]

(7) So far as natural divination pointed to a perfect realization of the idea of moral excellence in man, it was obliged either to give up the attempt to show how historically it is to be brought about, or to seek the historical point of connection within its own horizon; and the *διαθῆκαι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* (Eph. ii. 12) with which God has connected the historical development of His kingdom being outside of this horizon, it must necessarily make mistakes. Of the first kind are theories like Plato's delineation of the ideal of a just man, who, without having done any-

thing wrong, appears to be unrighteous; who is chained, scourged, blinded, and at last even impaled (*Rep.* ii. p. 361); and of which Lasaulx (*id.* p. 23) says that he never in the sacred books of the Jews met with any more magnificent prophecy concerning the Lord's holy and righteous One. (Comp. also his work, *Des Sokrates Leben, Lehre und Tod*, in which, p. 121, he ranks Socrates among the prophets.) Virgil is an example of the second kind, when in his celebrated 4th Eclogue he connects the return of the Golden Age with the consulate of Pollio and the birth of his son, and then in the *Æneid*, as is well known, sets up Augustus as the bringer in of a new age, but in both cases combines the *imperium sine fine* with Rome (*Æn.* i. ver. 278).

(8) What a struggle takes place in such cases between faith in providence and a lurking belief that the world is governed by a fate in which there is no moral element! (See § 8, note 2.)

(9) This point is calculated to show the contrast between Old Testament revelation and heathen manticism. The religious importance of manticism, like the power of ancient heathenism in general, rises and falls with the national life. The power of the oracles was broken with that of Hellenistic nationality; they were, as Plutarch testifies, no longer consulted on the more important occasions, but only on trifling matters, such as whether a marriage should be contracted, a voyage undertaken, whether corn and hay would yield well, etc.; which circumstance Plutarch adduces among others to explain why in his days the Pythia had ceased to give her answers in verses (*de Pyth. orac.* cap. 28, comp. with *de defectu orac.* cap. 7). But even for a Julian, Apollo had no longer an answer in readiness.

(10) Comp. also what has been already said, § 5, note 1, against the derivation of the Old Testament religion from the natural peculiarities of the Israelitish people.

(11) This relation of the subjectivity of the prophet to the revelation is so explained, from the Hegelian standpoint, that in the Old Testament the identity of the finite and the infinite subjectivity has not yet been infinitely brought to pass, but is only a direct one; which way of direct union did not suffer the two equally to attain their right, when they would have obliterated each other in the concrete spirituality (see Vatke, *die Religion des A. T.* p. 624 sq.). If, on the other hand, we put in the place of the logical process the historical development of revelation, as exhibited in Scripture, the result will be as stated § 204 in this respect.

(12) The importance of the propositions thus far developed will more clearly appear in the discussion of the *nature of prophecy*, to which we now proceed.

SECOND SUBDIVISION.

OF PROPHECY (1).

§ 213.

Its Office in General.

In the usual definition of prophecy formerly given, it was said to be the prediction, by means of Divine revelation, of any occurrence which was *contingent*, and therefore not to be foreknown by human wisdom (2). This definition is in every respect inadequate. According to the passage in Deuteronomy xviii. 9-22, discussed §§ 97 and 161, prophecy is said to secure to the people that which heathenism in vain sought to furnish by its manticism. Now even *heathen manticism* would not be correctly appreciated, if regarded merely as a means of inquiring into future contingent matters, and consequently as a means of satisfying human curiosity; that

is to say, if its religious element is made to consist only in the supplementary assistance of the Deity in those matters for which human reason and wisdom are insufficient (3). Manticism originates rather in the inalienable craving of the human spirit to know itself in active communion and to maintain a constant intercourse with Deity, and in the belief that God has not forsaken men, but makes their actions and all that befalls them the object of His care, and will for this reason manifest Himself unto them. What Manticism sought was to make known to man the will and counsel of God in all the important events of life; to give him information, especially at critical seasons, how to do what was right and pleasing to God (4). Such an *interpretatio divinæ voluntatis* as heathenism in vain endeavored to furnish, the word of prophecy afforded.

How far, now, does the announcement of the Divine will made by prophecy, extend? That the prophets were applied to for disclosures even in *matters of ordinary life*, is shown by such narratives as 1 Sam. ix. 6 sqq. (5); 1 Kings xiv. 1 sqq.; 2 Kings i. 3, and the well-known occurrences in the history of Elisha. In the *first place*, however, the Old Testament strictly insists that they who on any occasion seek a prophetic answer from God must earnestly seek Him and walk in His ways (6). The chief passage on this subject is Ezek. xiv. 1–20, comp. with xx. 1–4. The prophet is not to be at the beck of the elders of Israel, who inquire of the Lord with the mouth while they have set up their idols in their heart, but is rather to reprove their ungodliness. God will not be inquired of by a rebellious generation, because prophecy is not to be degraded into a plaything and an object of frivolous curiosity. In the *second place*, this condescension to the ordinary requirements of the people, which was to enable them to dispense with seeking counsel from heathen soothsayers (7), is an element kept quite in the background in prophecy (8). On the whole, prophecy was designed to educate the nation to a perception of what kind of knowledge of the future could alone be a blessing to man, by opening its eyes to the holy government of God in history and to the aims of Divine providence, that thus it might learn to prepare for coming judgments (comp. passages such as Amos iv. 12, etc.), and, walking in the light of its own calling to salvation, and of the great future which this involved, might regard it as beneath its dignity to yield to the yearning for soothsaying; comp. as chief passages, Isa. ii. 5 sq. in connection with vers. 1–4. If, then, we regard the collective contents of the prophetic books of the Old Testament, we must say that prophecy is employed entirely in promoting *the interests of the kingdom of God*, and that its main office is to unfold its ways. In saying this, we have not, however, as yet answered the question whether prophecy as such is a *prediction* of individual occurrences, and if so, what are its characteristics, and how is it related to its fulfilment? (9).

(1) [On this whole subject, comp. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy, its origin, historical character, and relation to the New Testament fulfilment*, 1875.]

(2) So *e.g.* Vitringa, *Typus doctrinæ propheticæ*, p. 2: "Prophetia *est prædictio casus aut eventus contingentis futuri temporis ex revelatione divina*," which thus excludes from prophecy all *eventus necessarii*, such as the succession of day and night, the ebb and flow of the tide, etc., and on the other hand designates *hominum volitiones et actiones liberæ, earumque consequentia*, as its *verum ac proprium objectum*, —a remarkable definition, according to which those *Divine counsels* which are independent of human freedom could not be the object of prophecy.

(3) Comp. my essay "On the relation of O. T. prophecy to the heathen manticism." This view of manticism is only suitable to the times of its decadence, when it had become with some, an empty form maintained only for political objects; with others, a superstition subserving only the most insignificant purposes of daily life, and estranged from all higher aims; and when even the Stoics, in their philosophical justification of manticism, only attempted to assert for it an essentially theoretical interest, viz. that it might in individual cases disclose to human apprehension that unchangeable causality of things which has its foundation in the eternal law of fate (see Wachsmuth, *Die Ansichten der Stoiker über Mantik und Dämonen*, 1860, especially p. 22 sqq.).

(4) Man longs for the Divine consent, for the assurance of the Divine blessing, even when a resolution has been formed after mature deliberation; or, when threatening premonitions of Divine judgments appear, he desires to learn from the Deity Himself the means of expiation, and of deliverance from the curse resting upon him.

(5) To be sure, the passage 1 Sam. ix. 6 sqq. leaves it uncertain whether Samuel would, under other circumstances, have given information concerning the lost asses. Still the parenthetical note ver. 9 is a proof that the prophets might be consulted on such matters.

(6) Saul, after being rejected, obtained in his helpless condition no other answer from God than one of judgment, 1 Sam. xxviii. 6; so, too, the wife of Jeroboam, when consulting the prophet Ahijah concerning her sick child, received, besides the unwished-for disclosure, a stern rebuke, 1 Kings xiv. 6–16.

(7) Comp. Origen, *c. Cels.* i. 354; Redepenning, *Origenes*, i. p. 287.

(8) We have herein, as H. Schultz (*Göttinger gel. Anz.* 1862, p. 230) justly remarks, a testimony "how Divine revelation so adapted itself to the natural soil of human manners and customs, as not on every occasion instantly to reject what was out of harmony with it, but allowed it to perish gradually, in virtue of its own vanity, in presence of the Divine."

(9) On the history of different views of prophecy, and the course of its treatment in Patristic and Protestant theology, see the article in Herzog, xvii. p. 644 sqq. [Also the parts pertaining to this subject in Diestel's *Geschichte des A. T. in der Christlichen Kirche*, 1869; Orelli, § 9, and Böhl, *Christologie des A. T.* § 4; the position of the latter writer is conservative, and agrees with the older views.]

§ 214.

The Prediction of Particular Events an Essential Element of Prophecy.

According to the theory of some, the sole essential feature of prophecy is declared to be its expression of the *general ideas of the Divine government;* while its prediction of particular events is, on the other hand, to be regarded as comparatively unessential and subordinate; so especially Hengstenberg, in his article on the exposition of the prophets, in the *Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, 1833, No. 23 sq. (1); nay, the very admissibility of prediction is denied by the *rationalistic* party, on the ground of its destroying human freedom and interfering with history. The latter proposition, indeed, if laid down as universal, would lead to a view of the world decidedly unreasonable, and at any rate unscriptural. For what kind of a course of the world would that be, which should be dependent in its chief elements solely upon the accidental decisions of the human will? Old Testament theology, however, has to do only with the question *whether prophecy does or does not attribute to itself as essential the characteristic of predicting particular events* (2); and in this respect it may suffice to bring forward, besides the fundamental passage Deut. xviii. 22, the very decided expressions contained on this subject in the prophetical book,

Isa. xl. sqq. Here we find the greatest emphasis laid upon the circumstances that the deliverance of Israel from the Babylonian captivity had been long predicted by prophecy, and that the prophet now speaking foretells the appearance of Cyrus before it takes place. It maintains also that the prediction of such particular events is a proof that the God of Israel is the true God, while on the other hand it asserts that the vanity of the heathen gods is manifested by their inability to foretell anything; see xli. 21–28, xlii. 9. When it is said in the latter passage, "New things do I declare: *before they spring forth* I tell you of them," the idea of pure prediction could hardly be more precisely expressed; comp. also xliii. 9–13, xliv. 25 sq., xlv. 21. The unbelief of the people is represented, xlviii. 3, as without excuse, for the very reason that the predictions of the prophets were authenticated by their fulfilment. And when it is said, ver. 7, "They are created now, and not from the beginning, even before the day when thou heardest them not; lest thou shouldest say, Behold, I knew them," prophecy is here very decidedly distinguished from a mere calculation of what the present might further develop.

But while, in accordance with the declarations of the Old Testament, we claim for prophecy the characteristic of prediction, we *by no means assert the complete identity of the prediction with its fulfilment.* Against such a supernaturalistic view of prophecy, as regards it, so to speak, as only the mirrored reflection, cast backward from the future, of New Testament personages and occurrences, it is very easy to contend, and to show how very differently the Old Testament prophecies would have run if they had been of this nature. The inalienable connection of the words of revelation with its facts, and therewith the genuine *historical* nature of revelation, would be annulled, nay, the pre-eminence belonging to the New Testament itself be lost, if a substantially complete representation of New Testament redemption were already placed before us in Old Testament prophecy. A closer investigation of the peculiarities of the latter enables us to discern also the limits prescribed to it, and the incompleteness pertaining to it. In discussing this point, we shall proceed from what was stated in the first subdivision concerning the prophetic consciousness.

(1) According to Hengstenberg, no prophecy refers solely to any special case. "Such exposition may be serviceable to apologetics; but apologetics is only for the few, and not of sufficient importance even to them, for God to have done so much in this respect." If prophecy seems to foretell any special case, it is merely the most obvious realization of the idea in an object. Everything in prophecy applies to the one church of God existing in uninterrupted continuity throughout the ages. Within us and without us, we again find Israel, Edom, and Babylon. Nothing any longer appears to us merely past, nothing merely future; but all equally past, present, and future, as cannot but be the case with the word of the eternal God. The temporal and local definiteness of individual fulfilments is simply incidental. If, nevertheless, we are obliged to own that some predictions are special and historically characteristic, these appear merely as concessions to the weak faith of the church.—That the influence of Schleiermacher's doctrine is, as has been remarked, perceptible in the turn here taken by Hengstenberg's theory of prophecy, is possible so far as this—that Schleiermacher (*Der christliche Glaube*, § 103. 3) regards as the essential element of prophecy, not a prediction relating to particulars, to which now a less now a higher degree of correctness pertains, but the manifestation of general principles. There is, however, this difference between the two, that Schleiermacher sees in the ideas of Divine election and

retribution by which prophecy is pervaded, only "Jewish notions," and finds the Messianic element of prophecy in the fact that it expresses the future of the Sent of God in a manner which, rightly understood, involves the "termination of these two Jewish ideas;" while Hengstenberg, on the contrary, acknowledges, as has been said, in the prophetic ideas—after, indeed, divesting them of their particular definiteness—the eternal laws of God's government of the world and the church. And who can deny to Hengstenberg the special merit of having, by thus giving prominence to the enduring value of prophecy, again set up that prophetic word, which had long lain under a bushel, as a light to enable us to understand the ways of God, and of having again rendered accessible to many, the treasures of instruction and consolation contained therein for all ages of the church militant?

(2) Comp. Bleek, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, ii. p. 23; Orelli, p. 32 sq., 59 sq.; König ii. § 27, especially p. 291 sqq., 318 sqq.

§ 215.

The Peculiarities of Old Testament Prophecy (1).

1. The matter of revelation being given to the prophets in the form of intuition (§ 210), the *future appeared to them as immediately present*, complete, or at all events in progress. Hence the frequent use of the so-called *Præteritum propheticum*, by the misunderstanding of which, prediction has so often been taken as a description of the past; comp. *e.g.* Isa. ix. 1, 5 (2). How great soever the distance, according to human computation, of the things predicted, they are *actually in train* to the prophetic eye, and all that intervenes can only help to hasten their fulfilment. See as a chief passage, Hab. ii. 3: "The vision is yet for an appointed time, but it hastens to its end, and lies not; though it tarry, wait for it, for it will surely come, it will not tarry." What the prophet sees are, as they are called Rev. i. 1, simply things *ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει*: for in the invisible world which is disclosed to the prophet, all is active, in motion, about to approach.—Connected with this peculiarity of prophecy is the circumstance that *it gives for the most part only a subordinate importance to dates*—for the most part, we say, for there are certainly cases where great emphasis is laid upon them, as *e.g.* Ezek. xii., where the prophet announces to those who inconsiderately derided the predicted judgments because their fulfilment was delayed, that this fulfilment should *shortly* take place; while on the other hand we find some cases, *e.g.* Dan. x. 14, where the vision points to a more remote time. Sometimes the dates given have evidently a *symbolical* meaning, and must not for this reason be pressed to the very letter. Such are the seventy years of Tyre, "according to the days of one king," Isa. xxiii. 15, 17; the seventy years, Jer. xxv.; the seventy weeks of Daniel, ch. ix. Such dates, too, as those of Isa. xvi. 14, xxi. 16, may be included. In general, however, the word of the Lord, Acts i. 7: *οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γνῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιρούς, οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*, applies also to the prophets, who limit themselves to indefinite dates, such as: in that day (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא); after this (אַחֲרֵי כֵן), etc. *The grouping of that which is predicted according to the necessary sequences of its essential elements* takes the place of chronological statements. And this is effected in the following manner: While heathenism can attain to no knowledge of the issue of its history, it is essential to Old Testament prophecy to be always directed to *the consummation of the kingdom of God*, by announcing *the ways in which God conducts His purpose of salvation, from the actual present to its*

appointed end. In other words, what takes place בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים forms the boundary of the prophetic horizon. This expression does not signify, as it has often been explained, "in the time to come," "in the future," but (אַחֲרִית signifying, in contrast to רֹאשׁ, that to which anything runs) "at the end of the days," *i.e.* at the close of this dispensation, as correctly rendered by the LXX by *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*, or *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου* (*ἐσχάτων*) *τῶν ἡμερῶν*. It is true that the meaning is a *relative* one. In Gen. xlix. 1, where the expression first occurs, it refers to the time of the settlement of the tribes in the promised land; for the final fulfilment of the Divine promise is thus made the standpoint of Jacob's blessing. In Deut. iv. 3 it denotes the time which forms the turning-point for the restoration of Israel; while in xxxi. 29, on the contrary, the rejection of Israel is itself reckoned to pertain to the אַחֲרִית. But in prophetic diction, properly so called, אַחֲרִית is, as has been said, the time of the consummation of redemption (Hos. iii. 5, Isa. ii. 3, with Mic. iv. 1, Jer. xlviii. 47, Ezek. xxxviii. 16). The event next preceding this אַחֲרִית is judgment, and indeed judgment both upon the rebellious people of God and the sinful world. This judgment is directly connected with the days in which the prophet lives, for these, because of the sins of Israel and the Gentile nations, already bear in their bosom the judgments of God. Thus the matter of prophecy may be defined by its three elements,—*guilt*, *judgment* (first upon the house of God, then upon the world), *redemption*. The progress of the kingdom of God forms itself, in prophetic vision, into a picture in which judgment generally forms the foreground and redemption the background. In the Book of Isaiah, xl. sqq., on the other hand, redemption occupies the foreground, but still in such wise that its blessings are depicted as not unaccompanied by judgment. The contemplation of impending judgments, then, usually extends to that of the last judgment, as *e.g.* in the Book of Joel, where the description of the devastation by locusts, with which Judah is chastised, is enlarged into a description of the coming of the last day (the day of the Lord), the final judgment, which, however, on Judah's repentance, is, though invoked upon her, inflicted upon the secular powers; and as in New Testament prophecy also (Matt. xxiv.), the judgment upon the world is placed in direct connection with that upon Jerusalem. So, too, the contemplation of approaching deliverance is usually extended to take in the consummation of redemption, as *e.g.* Isa. vii.–xii. proceeds from an announcement of deliverance from Assyria, to a prophecy of Messianic blessings. Thus prophecy beholds in every event the coming of the Judge and Saviour of the world to set up His kingdom. In this combination of the nearer and more distant future—in this placing of the present government of God's kingdom in the light of the end—lies what has been called the *perspective* character of prophecy, as Bengel in particular, in his Gnomon on Matt. xxiv. 29, has so aptly designated it (3). This characteristic of prophecy is manifested with especial beauty in the Book of Isaiah, xl.–lxvi. The Divine act of delivering the people from the Babylonian captivity, and their restoration to the promised land, form, with the Messianic redemption and the admission of all nations into the kingdom of God, one great connected picture, closing with the creation of the new heavens and the new earth (4). To the prophets themselves, moreover, the time when their predictions should be fulfilled was, as we are told 1 Pet. i. 11, a subject of investigation.

2. The fact that the matter of prophecy is given in the form of such an intuition, also furnishes the reason why it always sees the realization of that matter in *particular events which are complete in themselves.* Thus in Joel, ch. iii., the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the people of God is conceived of as a single act amid tremendous natural phenomena, and so also the judgment of the world is mostly represented as a single act of judgment against the secular power at the moment present to the mind of the prophet. In the *fulfilment*, on the contrary, that which is but momentary in the prophetic intuition is accomplished by a process of long and gradual development (5); and when a prediction attains its first stage of fulfilment, there opens out from the standpoint of subsequent prophets, in virtue of that *law of dilation*, as Ebrard in his *Commentary on Hebrews* calls it, a new perspective toward the consummation of judgment and redemption. Hence it is that many expositors speak of a two, a three, or even a fourfold fulfilment.

(1) [On this and the following section, comp. Orelli, § 47; König, ii., § 27, appendix, also p. 367 sqq.]

(2) Isa. ix. 2: "The people that walked in darkness, רָאוּ אוֹר גָּדוֹל." Ver. 6 says of the birth of the Messiah: יֶלֶד יֻלַּד-לָנוּ; and this has been said to mean Hezekiah, then twelve years of age, as the destined deliverer of the people.

(3) Bengel says, *id.: Prophetia est ut pictura regionis cujuspiam, quæ in proximo tecta et colles et pontes notat distincte, procul valles et montes latissime patentes in angustum cogit.* Velthusen contributes much good matter on this point in the article *De optica rerum futurarum descriptione*, in the *Commentationes theologicæ* of Velthusen, Kuinoel, and Ruperti, vi. 1799, p. 75 sqq.

(4) The view of a perspective character in prophecy is not refuted by what Steudel has advanced against it, in his article on the interpretation of the prophets in the *Tübinger Zeitschr.* 1834, p. 121 sqq.

(5) Compare what is said (§ 221) on the description of the judgment of the world in Amos, compared with that in Joel.

§ 216.

Continuation.

3. Since the matter of prophecy presents itself to view as a multitude of individual facts, it may sometimes appear as though single predictions *contradicted each other*, when they are in fact only *those parts into which the ideas revealed have been separated, mutually completing each other.* Thus *e.g.*, the representation of the Messiah is at one time that of the gentle Prince of Peace, at another that of a powerful and warlike hero who overthrows His enemies; on the one side a successful ruler, on the other the servant of God who atones for the sins of the people by undergoing death. On the part of the prophets themselves, even when they unite such discrepant features, the union, as the nature of an intuition involves, is merely one of external juxtaposition. The two characteristics, *e.g.*, of the Messianic age, that therein the kingdom of God should triumph over all enemies, and that nevertheless it should be a period of universal peace, are thus united, Mic. v. 3–10: the Messiah is great, even to the ends of the earth; He feeds His people, He is the peace. When, however, the Assyrian (the hostile secular power, according to the prophet's horizon) should invade the land, the war should be transferred to

his own country by a number of generals, the enemies of Israel exterminated, etc. The internal harmony of the two views—that Christ is our peace and at the same time one who has come to send a sword, that the kingdom of God is at once a contending and a peaceful kingdom—is first found in the New Testament. The fact that Old Testament prophecy continues to behold the particular as particular, is most clearly shown by the two parallel lines on which it advances, and according to which, while the promised redemption is made on the one hand to depend upon the *coming of Jehovah Himself* to His holy temple to set up His kingdom on Zion, it is connected on the other with the birth of the great *Branch of David*, to whom God will give in its full glory the kingdom of His ancestors (1). Both views are fulfilled in the σκήνωσις of the eternal λόγος in the Son of David, in which respect Paul's statement, in 2 Cor. i. 20, that all the promises of God are yea and amen, and are harmoniously fulfilled in Him, holds good, while the knowledge of individual prophets still continues but fragmentary (1 Cor. xiii. 9). [Comp. also Heb. i. 1.]

4. The matter of prophecy being given to the prophets in the form of intuition, it is *brought down*, so far as its form is concerned, to the *plane of the beholder* himself ; hence prophecy is affected by the limits of the sphere of Old Testament life, the special relations of the age, and the individual peculiarity of the prophet. The *future kingdom of God* is beheld by the prophets as being in all essential matters an extended and glorified form of the Old Testament theocracy. The admission of the nations into this kingdom is their travelling to Mount Zion (Isa. ii.), their attainment of rights of citizenship in Jerusalem, Ps. lxxxvii., etc. (2).; the hostile world is personified, in the prophetic intuition, in Assyria, Egypt, Babylon, Moab, Edom, etc., who were then the enemies of Israel. This, which has been called the *Old Testament outer covering of prophecy*, is incorrectly regarded, especially by Hengstenberg, as a merely symbolical covering in the *consciousness of the prophets themselves*. A consciously symbolical diction is indeed frequently used by the prophets, as by other authors. In many cases there may also be in the prophets a conscious fluctuation between symbolical and literal language ; nay, it is often evident how superior is the fulness of the idea, how far the Divine matter surpasses its limited form. One may often feel, when reading the prophetic word, how much further the spiritual meaning reaches than the letter expresses ; how prophecy struggles, as it were, to give its thoughts an adequate embodiment. Compare such descriptions as Zech. ii. and similar passages (3). Generally speaking, however, the prophets, when beholding the future state of God's kingdom in an Old Testament form, mean just what they say. As they understand it, the Holy Land and Jerusalem are to be the centres of the glorified kingdom of God, and restored Israel is to be at the head of the nations, etc. ; when they prophesy against Assyria, Babylon, and Edom, they mean these very powers, and the κόσμος hostile to the kingdom of God is represented *to them* by those then existent kingdoms. It is not the consciousness of the individual prophet, but the Spirit of revelation, which already within the Old Testament strips off, as may often be pointed out, at every higher stage of prophecy, the temporary form cleaving to earlier stages, until the fulfilment fully shows how far the symbolical covering extended. The identity of prophecy and fulfilment is not a direct but an indirect one, brought about by means of an historical process,

which conducts to a higher realization that which, at a preparatory stage, had been beheld in a still inadequate form. On the other hand, however, even the symbolical covering of prophecy must not be treated as something non-essential. For the ideas of revelation do not appear, even in their Old Testament fulfilment, as abstract propositions, but as Divine acts, as a history of the kingdom of God. In virtue of the organic connection existing between the two Testaments, revelation brings forth in the New Testament circumstances, conditions, and facts which are *analogous*, even with respect to their external form, to their pre-representation in the Old. And this is to say that the Old Testament form, with which the matter of prophecy is covered, is *typical* of the form of the New Testament fulfilment, and that the coincidence of the two may extend to individual features (4).

5. Finally, in forming a correct judgment of the relation between prophecy and fulfilment, the point yet remains to be considered, that God having in His revelation placed Himself in an *historical* relation with mankind, and the kingdom of God therefore advancing, not by a process of nature, but as a moral institution, the fulfilment of prophecy is not placed outside the sphere of *human freedom*, although the Divine council cannot in the end fail to come to pass in spite of all opposition. As the fulfilment of the promises and threats connected with the law (Ex. xxiii. 20–33, Lev. xxvi., Deut. viii. sq.) depends upon the attitude of the people with respect to the law, while still the final realization of the theocratic destination of Israel is beyond all question (Lev. xxvi. 44 sqq., Deut. xxx. 1–6, compare § 90, p. 197), so is it also with the teachings of prophecy. These, like the law, subserves, in the first place, an *educational* purpose, by making disclosures concerning the future to man for his good. God having, as it is said Ezek. xxxiii. 11, no pleasure in the death of a sinner, but in his turning from his ways, the first purpose of the prophetic announcement of *judgment* is to lead the people to repentance; and hence, if this repentance takes place, the threatened judgments may be averted (5). The Old Testament declares as clearly as possible, that not every predicted judgment must of necessity be inflicted in the manner spoken; that the Divine threatening leaves man for a long time space for repentance; that there is even, as it is expressed, a Divine "repenting," and that not merely with respect to Israel, but to heathen nations also. Comp. such passages as Joel ii. 12 sqq. (according to which the judgment already approaching might be averted by repentance, and indeed was subsequently averted), Jer. iv. 3 sq., xxvi. 3, xxxvi. 3, Ezek. xviii. 30–32. The chief passage, however, is Jer. xviii. 1–10, whose purport is as follows: As the potter can immediately mar again the clay which he had formed into a vessel, if the vessel displeases him, so can Jehovah alter the form and fate of a nation as He pleases. In such non-fulfilment, however, of His threats and promises, He acts not arbitrarily, but according to a law of righteous retribution (6). This doctrine forms, as is obvious, one of the fundamental thoughts of the Book of Jonah (iii. 3–10); comp. also narratives like 2 Sam. xii. 13; 1 Kings xxi. 28 sq.; and especially Jer. xxvi. 18 sq. It is also shown, Amos vii. 1–6, how the intercession for the sinful people, of the just who stand in the gap, may avail to avert a threatened judgment. There is, however, a *limit* to the respites granted by God's long-suffering. The impenitence of the people may reach a height at which no intercession on the part of the righteous

remnant is any longer possible, ver. 8, Jer. xv. 1, and when the prophetic announcement of judgment is no longer intended to evoke repentance, but to mature obduracy; comp. as chief passage, Isa. vi. 9 sqq. In such cases, those predictions also whose fulfilment has been hitherto delayed, reappear in full force. We see this from the quotation in Jer. xxvi. 18 of the prediction of Micah. To the people of his time this prophet had uttered the prediction: "Zion shall be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of a forest." When, then, as it is further said, ver. 19, Hezekiah feared the Lord, and besought the Lord, "the Lord repented of the evil which He had pronounced against them." As soon, however, as the penitent return of the people was followed by a fresh apostasy, the threats of judgment again became valid, and the subsequent generation experienced their complete fulfilment. So, too, when *blessings* are predicted, the fulfilment of such prediction depends upon moral causes, viz. upon the obedient submission of the people to the Divine will, while, nevertheless, this fulfilment cannot be rendered doubtful by any obstacles which man can oppose to it (7). Nor does the latter result from Zech. vi. 15 (8). This passage cannot be understood as making the appearance of the Messiah, and especially the participation of the Gentiles in His kingdom, depend on the fidelity of the covenant people, though it does connect the mode in which the promise should be fulfilled, the how, and the how far Israel should become the stock and branch of the future Church, with the obedience of the people to the Divine word (9).

(1) We shall subsequently see (§ 229) how even the Old Testament struggles to harmonize both views.

(2) Comp. how, according to § 201, sacrificial service is continued in the worship of the future. [But is it not spiritual sacrifice?—D.]

(3) When Zech. ii. describes the future times of redemption, in which, ver. 11, the heathen nations join themselves to the Lord, it is evident that such a kingdom of God can no longer be concentrated within the narrow walls of the ancient Jerusalem. How then is the matter presented to prophetic intuition? פְּרָזוֹת תֵּשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם, Jerusalem is to lie open like a village, as a free and public district; Jehovah is Himself the fiery wall around her, and the glory in the midst of her. (But this is not saying, as Kliefoth explains the matter, that the Jerusalem of the latter days is to extend over the whole earth, and to be a multitude of residences scattered over the whole world.)

(4) So *e.g.* in the prophetic delineation (Isa. liii.) of the Servant of the Lord atoning by His death for the sins of the people, and afterward glorified. To this must be added, that neither do we as yet behold the *physical* nature of the Divine kingdom, but are still waiting, on the assurance of New Testament prophecy, which has taken up and carried on that of the old covenant, for the time when, as it is said Rev. xxi. 3, a tabernacle of God will be among men. For this reason it would ill become an expositor to attempt to determine beforehand how far the last form of the kingdom of God is to coincide with the prophetic descriptions of the last things. When Hengstenberg (*Christology*, i. p. 281 sq.) declares himself opposed to those who dream of some future restoration of Israel to the Holy Land, and says, "Even supposing the children of Israel were to return to Canaan, this would have nothing to do with the prophecy in question" (Hos. ii. 2), he asserts more than any one has a right to do (comp. also the above article, p. 650).

(5) Jerome on Ezek. xxxiii. (ed. Vallars, v. p. 396) rightly defines this purpose when he says: "*Nec statim sequitur, ut, quia propheta prædicit, veniat, quod præ-*

dixit. Non enim prædixit, ut veniat, sed ne veniat: nec quia Deus loquitur, necesse est fieri quod minatur, sed ideo comminatur, ut convertatur ad pœnitentiam cui minatur, et non fiat quod futurum est, si verba Domini contemnantur."

(6) Jer. xviii. 7 sq.: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."

(7) Comp. on this subject Caspari, on Micah, p. 160 sqq., and his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Buch Jesaja*, p. 96 sqq. The relation of prophecy to fulfilment has been elucidated from this point of view, especially by Bertheau in his article, "Die alttest. Weissagung von Israels Reichsherrlichkeit in seinem Lande," *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1859 and 1860, in which, however, he goes so far, as Tholuck (*id.* p. 139) justly observes, as to run the risk of making the idea not only of prediction but even of prophecy wholly illusory. See what is further stated in opposition to Bertheau in the above article, p. 658.

(8) Zech. vi. 15: "They that are far off shall come and build in the temple of the Lord. . . . And it shall come to pass, if ye will diligently obey the voice of the Lord your God." Comp. Hengstenberg, *Christology*, iii. p. 361 f.

(9) Israel may, through unfaithfulness, be again in such a condition as that which it incurred by its apostasy before the Babylonian captivity. But is the *consummation* of redemption possible while Israel is, as a nation, in a state of rejection? The Old Testament returns an absolute negative to this question. It speaks only of a temporary rejection, which, moreover, takes place in such wise that Israel does not perish as a nation, but is preserved for future restoration. Was, then, this law abolished when Israel rejected the gracious visitation of their Messiah, and the kingdom of God was taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof? (Matt. xxi. 43.) Are the predictions of the prophets which speak of the glories of Israel in the latter days abrogated? or are they only spiritually fulfilled to the Christian church, of which the stock indeed was formed by the elect of Israel? These questions are answered by Bertheau (in accordance with the older Protestant theology; see p. 646 of the article cited) as decidedly in the affirmative, as, we feel convinced, especially on the ground of Rom. xi. 25 sqq., they should be in the negative. See further particulars in the article quoted, p. 659. Comp. also Luthardt, *die Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, pp. 18 and 106 sqq. [On the other hand, Keil, *Comm. on Ezekiel*, ii. 138–157, and *Bib. Sacra*, iv. 337–369.—D.]

FOURTH DIVISION.

OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

§ 217.

Survey.

The chief elements in the process of the development of the kingdom of God are, according to prophetic intuition, the following. Prophecy starts from the state of contradiction to its Divine election into which Israel fell by apostasy. Sinful Israel belied its blessed vocation. Instead of testifying for the true God before the heathen, its character testifies against Him. God's holiness obliges Him to do away with this contradiction. The means by which He effects this end is

the infliction of judgment. He expels His revolted people from their home, and delivers them up to the heathen powers. Thus, however, a fresh contradiction arises: Israel was chosen to realize the Divine purpose of redemption even among the heathen; but now that judgment has fallen upon Israel, the heathen powers triumph over the people of Jehovah, and therefore, as they suppose, over Jehovah Himself. This contradiction also must be done away with; and this is effected by the judgments inflicted upon the heathen powers for their self-exaltation against the Lord, even after they had fulfilled the Divine counsels; and by the destruction of every secular power; and the restoration, through this universal judgment, of the covenant people, who, though rejected, were preserved in rejection for the fulfilment of their destination. The remnant of the people is, however, restored under the great Son of David in such wise that it is now capable, as a church inwardly sanctified, of realizing the Divine counsel. It now fulfils its mission,—light going forth from it to the Gentile world, and the remnants of the nations preserved from judgment being incorporated therein, and assisting in their turn in bringing back the still dispersed members of the covenant people, until throughout the whole world every knee shall bow before the living God, and every tongue confess Him. Jehovah has now taken possession of His sovereignty over the earth; His kingdom is come; the events of history are concluded (1).

(1) The attribute, in virtue of which God thus determines the progress of His kingdom on earth by judgment and deliverance, is His צְדָקָה, *His righteousness.*

FIRST SUBDIVISION.

THE PURPOSE OF GOD'S KINGDOM; THE CONTRADICTION THERETO PRESENTED BY THE PRESENT; THE ABOLITION OF THIS CONTRADICTION BY JUDGMENT.

I. THE DESIGN OF GOD'S KINGDOM.

§ 218.

The idea of God's purpose in setting up a kingdom includes the following *elements:* 1. *Jehovah* as the Creator and Lord of the world is in Himself the *God of all nations;* but, 2. He is *not yet* God to all nations, and is only manifest as God to Israel, His chosen people; 3. By *means of Israel*, however, He is to be universally known and acknowledged; as He is now the King of His own people, His kingdom is to be set up among all the nations of the world by their means (1). Of these elements, the first two are, as we have seen (§ 81), clearly contained in the Pentateuch; it may suffice to mention Ex. xix. 5 sq. Nor is the third element absent from the Pentateuch (2); but it is only brought prominently forward in the patriarchal promise, by which the severance of a race to become the recipients of revelation was accompanied: in the seed of Abraham shall all the families of the earth bless themselves, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 14, comp. § 23, with note 5. This element, on the other hand, falls into the background at the period of the foundation of the theocracy. Even

though it is said to Pharaoh, Ex. ix. 16, "For this purpose have I raised thee up, . . . that my name may be declared throughout the whole earth;" and though the Lord swears, Num. xiv. 21, "As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord;" that which is first of all implied is the glorification of the power and greatness of the living God before all the heathen, as it had already been glorified before the gods of Egypt, the future admission of the heathen into the kingdom of God being not as yet announced by these words. The latter thought is first brought into full light by *prophecy*. In the *older* prophets, indeed, the political horizon is still very limited, including at first only *the neighboring nations;* still their descriptions of God's guidance of the history of these people, see *e.g.* Amos i. sq. (comp. also vi. 14, § 176), ix. 7 (§ 219, note 4), presuppose that universal reign which is distinctly expressed in the judgment depicted in Joel iii. When, however, Israel fully entered into conflict with the secular powers, and thus appeared on a wider historical stage, prophecy clearly and completely recognized that government of the God of Israel which embraces all nations, determines their history, and directs all their ways toward the accomplishment of His own purposes. It is the Lord who, according to Isa. x. 5 sqq., uses the *Assyrian* power as the rod of His anger, and directs every step of the conqueror, xxxvii. 28. From Him proceed, according to ch. xix., the revolutions and civil wars of *Egypt*, which are to prepare for its conversion; for, according to ver. 23, the Egyptians are one day to serve Him with the Assyrians. It is He who, according to Hab. i. 6 sq., arouses the *Chaldeans* and causes them to perform terrible acts; who, according to Jer. xxvii. 5 sqq., made the earth and all that is upon it, and gives it to whom He will; who now gives all lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, His servant. Ezekiel declares, xxxi. 9, that it is He who raised the king of Egypt to the height of prosperity, and again (xxx. 4 sq.) put the sword into the hand of the king of Babylon to overthrow the power of Egypt, and to show the Egyptians that He is the true God. It is He who is said, Isa. xiii. 3 sq., Jer. li. 11 sqq., to lead the Median hosts against Babylon, and, Isa. xli. sqq., to use Cyrus, though he knows it not, as His instrument. The purpose, however, of all this intervention of God in the heathen world is expressed, xlv. 22 sq., in the words: "Turn unto me, . . . all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." The *Book of Daniel*, in particular, portrays in magnificent touches the universality of the Divine kingdom: "God changeth times and seasons: He removeth kings and setteth up kings," ii. 21. The kingdoms of the world which are from beneath have run their course according to His appointment, ch. ii. and vii., that the kingdom of God which is to come from above, and which all people and tongues must serve, vii. 14, may be set up in its eternal power and glory.

(1) [Comp. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, where the connection of the extension of the kingdom of God to all nations with the Old Testament idea of God and man, is more fully discussed.]

(2) Comp. the prophetic words of Noah, § 21, with note (2).

II. THE RELATION OF THE PRESENT TO THE PURPOSE OF THE DIVINE KINGDOM.

§ 219.

What, then, it may be asked, is the relation of the *present* to the purpose of God's kingdom? Israel and the nations of the world are in a state of contradiction thereto. With respect to Israel, we have already described, in § 202, and need not here repeat, how the conviction dawned upon the prophets that the Israel of the present was incapable of fulfilling its mission to the world. This nation, which was to be the means of converting the heathen to God, had become worse than the heathen; comp. also the passage not quoted in that section, Ezek. v. 5 sqq. (1). In what relation, then, do the *heathen* stand to the kingdom of God? is a question which we must now enter into somewhat more particularly. The doctrine that the heathen, as such, form with respect to the privileged people of God a class entirely without rights, nay, exposed to the wrath of God, has been attributed to the Old Testament. [The false view to which the author objects is that the heathen are under the Divine displeasure *on account of not being Jews.* He would not deny, as the latter part of the section shows, that their idolatry and rejection of God justly expose them to punishment.—D.] According to this view, the roots of the well-known haughty particularism of the Pharisees are to be found in the Old Testament. But if it is said, Jer. x. 25 (comp. with the parallel passage, Ps. lxxix. 6 sq.), "Pour out Thy fury upon the heathen that have not known Thee, and upon the families that call not upon Thy name," it is added, "For they have eaten up Jacob, and devoured him, and consumed him," etc., showing that not the heathen in general are intended, but the nations who have raged against Israel. If Mal. i. 2, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," is also appealed to, and the question asked, Is it not here taught that God, for no reason but of His own choice, loves one people and makes another a vessel of wrath?—we reply that, though this expression cannot be got over, as Steudel endeavors, by taking it in a merely relative signification, as though to *hate* meant only to love less, still we have here no causeless *reprobatio* in the sense of a Calvinistic absolute decree, for in ver. 4 it is immediately added, "Edom is a region of wickedness" (גְּבוּל רִשְׁעָה); and this is explained by the prophetical passages, Joel iv. 19, Amos i. 9, etc., concerning Edom's rage against the covenant people. More difficult is, at the first glance, the much-discussed passage, Isa. xliii. 3 sq.: "I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Cush and Seba for thee, because thou wast precious in my sight," etc.; "therefore I gave men for thee, and nations for thy life." Does, then, this passage indeed teach that God substitutes guiltless nations for His chosen people, who properly deserve punishment? By no means. The passage only applies to the history of nations the principle laid down, Prov. xi. 8 and xxi. 18, with respect to individuals (2), viz. that God's judgments upon the wicked subserve the best interests of the godly. For an intimation that these heathen nations were innocent victims for the sake of Israel, is no more given in this place than in the case of Pharaoh, when he is set forth, Ex. ix. 16, as an example of judgment. The heathen nations are not, indeed, entitled to any favor from God, inasmuch as they, like all creatures, can make no claims upon Him in whose presence they are,

as it is said, Isa. xl. 15–17, "as a drop of a bucket, as the small dust of the balance, as nothing." But this is true of Israel also, according to its condition by nature; comp. Deut. vii. 7 (§ 81), Isa. xlv. 9 sqq. (3). Israel itself has only a claim of *grace*, and that a conditional one. The prophets constantly testify against the delusion that the fact of their election could give the rebellious nation claims upon God. On the contrary, the significant passage, Amos ix. 7, declares the covenant-breaking people to be on a level with the heathen (4). On the other hand, God's long-suffering watches also over the heathen; comp. the passage Jer. xviii. 7 sq. (already quoted, § 216, and note 7, in another connection), and the Book of Jonah, which teaches how the patience of God gives to the heathen also space for repentance. The heathen are certainly already guilty before God on account of their idolatry, the folly and worthlessness of which they might readily have perceived (Isa. xl. 17 sqq., xli. 23 sq., xliv. 9, xlvi. 5 sq., Jer. x. 8 sqq., Ps. cxv. 4 sqq.). For this, however, they are punished by that state of helplessness into which all heathenism falls, and which shows that it is forsaken of God, as is so admirably portrayed in the prophecy concerning Moab, Isa. xv. sq. (comp. especially xvi. 12), in Isa. xli. 6 sq., and other passages. Undoubtedly certain expositors have explained passages like Ps. ix. 18: יָשׁוּבוּ רְשָׁעִים לִשְׁאוֹלָה כָּל-גּוֹיִם שְׁכֵחֵי אֱלֹהִים ("the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the heathen that forget God"), as declaring that the heathen are guilty, רְשָׁעִים, because they have *forgotten* and renounced that knowledge of God which was imparted to them by primitive revelation. But the context is decidedly against a theoretical view of the passage, and shows that a *practical* forgetfulness of God is intended when שְׁכֵחֵי אֱלֹהִים are spoken of, and therefore that the heathen have renounced that law of God which was known to them also. Hence the passage is well elucidated by Isa. xxiv., where the prophet sees a general judgment overwhelming the whole earth, because, according to ver. 5, "they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant," wherefore "the earth is defiled under the inhabitants thereof,"—the words evidently pointing back to the *Noachian covenant* with the world, and the law connected therewith. [It is quite possible, however, that this passage refers rather to the land of Israel, as Umbreit, Alexander, and many others hold.—D.] That, however, which properly exposes the heathen to the judgments proceeding from the God of Israel [viz. those which are specially threatened.—D.], is their *enmity toward the covenant people*, and this for the following reasons:—First. It is characteristic of Israel, as the covenant people, that no nation in the world was ever so bitterly hated by other nations as Israel was, because it claimed to be the Lord's people, not in the same manner as other nations might boast of their own gods without denying the existence of other gods, but because it declared the gods of other nations to be things of naught (§ 42. 2), and demanded of them submission to the God of Israel. For this reason, too, hatred to Israel was hatred to Israel's God. Malicious delight in the misfortunes of Israel was a joy that the God who was declared to be alone powerful was just as powerless as the people that were called by His name; comp. the defiant address of the generals of Sennacherib, xxxvi. 18–20. With this is connected, secondly, the fact that the heathen nations whom God made use of as instruments for the chastisement of His people did not regard themselves as such, but behaved toward them with self-exaltation, and treated them with unbounded cruelty.

Comp. such passages as Isa. x. 5 sqq. (5), Zech. i. 15, Isa. xlvii. 6. All human *ὕβρις*, however, as such, exposes to the judgment of God. The arrogant and self-relying creature must be reduced to its own nothingness by the holy God, Isa. ii. 11 sqq. (6). In the Old Testament it is chiefly Babylon which, in accordance with its origin (Gen. xi.), exhibits that Titanic pride, that self-deification, described Hab. i. 11, 16, Isa. xiv. 13 (7), which makes Babylon a typical instance of Divine judgment.

(1) Ezek. v. 5 sqq. : "This is Jerusalem which I have set in the midst of the nations and countries round about her. But she hath changed my judgments into wickedness more than the nations, and my statutes more than the countries round about her ; for they have refused my judgments and my statutes, they have not walked in them."

(2) Prov. xi. 8 : "The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his stead." *Ib.* xxi. 18 : "The wicked is a ransom for the righteous."

(3) Isa. xlv. 9 : "Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker, a potsherd among the potsherds of earth. Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou?"

(4) Amos ix. 7, the prophet exclaims to the sinful people : "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me? . . . have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor (Crete), and the Syrians from Kir?" The thought of this frequently misunderstood passage is identical with that of Rom. ii. 25 : *περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ἦς, ἡ περιτομή σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν.*

(5) Isa. x. 5 sqq. : Assyria is the rod in the hand of Jehovah. According to ver. 7, however, "he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so ;" and in ver. 13 he says : "By the strength of my hand have I done it, and by my wisdom ; for I am prudent."

(6) Isa. ii. 12 : The Lord of hosts holds a day upon every one that is proud and lofty and upon every one that is lifted up, and he shall be brought low. Comp. also the discussion of the Divine holiness in § 44.

(7) Hab. i. : It is the Lord who, according to ver. 6, raises up the Chaldeans, "the bitter and hasty nation," which rushes through the land and overcomes all opposition. In ver. 11, however, we are told of the Chaldean, that his strength is his god ; ver. 16 that "they sacrifice to their own net, and burn incense to their own drag," wherewith they fish for men. In Isa. xiv. 13, the Chaldean conqueror says, in his heart, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God, I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north," etc.

III. THE JUDGMENT.

§ 220.

The Day of the Lord. The Judgment upon the Covenant People.

"God that is holy sanctifies Himself in righteousness" (הָאֵל הַקָּדוֹשׁ נִקְדַּשׁ בִּצְדָקָה), Isa. v. 16 (1), by sending destructive judgments upon all that opposes His purpose of redemption, and thus insuring the triumph of His kingdom. The usual designation of this final theocratic judgment is, from Joel i. 15 and ii. 1 onward, יוֹם יְהוָה, "the day of Jehovah," comp. Zeph. i. 7 ; "the day of Jehovah's anger," ii. 3 ; "the great and terrible day of Jehovah," Mal. iv. 5 (2). It is the day on

which the Lord will humble all the loftiness of man, and will alone be exalted, Isa. ii. 17, comp. v. 16. The features by which the prophets portray this day, the manner in which they describe it as announced and accompanied by terrible natural phenomena, Joel iii. 3 sq., Isa. xiii. 9 sq., Zeph. i. 15 sqq.,—features which have been partially transferred to the eschatological passages of the New Testament,—are not to be regarded as merely poetic coloring, but rest upon the scriptural view of the inalienable connection between the course of nature and the progress of the Divine kingdom. The first question then is : *What is the connection between the judgments on the covenant people and the judgments on the heathen world?* They seem to stand in immediate connection in the great picture of judgment in Zeph. i. sq. We have here the same day of the Lord going forth upon Jerusalem and upon the nations of the world, the whole earth being consumed by the fire of the Divine wrath (3). More strictly speaking, however, the relation of the two judgments to each other is, that the *judgment of Israel in point of time precedes*, that of the nations of the world follows,—the deliverance of the covenant people being effected by means of the latter. Judgment must first begin at the house of God, as the apostle Peter expresses it (1 Pet. iv. 17). "You only have I known," it is said, Amos iii. 2, "of all the families of the earth : therefore will I punish you for your iniquities." Just because Israel was held up as an example to the world of how God loves, so is it now to bear witness how He punishes. "I will execute judgment in the midst of thee, in the sight of the nations," Ezek. v. 8. Every pledge of God's election now becomes a pledge of judgment to the apostate people. They who trust in being able to say, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord is here," are reminded by Jeremiah, vii. 4–15, how judgment had already fallen upon the place of the sanctuary at Shiloh. And Ezekiel, in the majestic vision recorded ch. ix., sees judgment beginning at the sanctuary and those who are called to be its guardians. We have lastly to notice the *historical progress* observable in the announcement of judgment upon the covenant people. In the Book of Joel, *Judah* is to incur only a visitation which leads the people to repentance (4). In *Amos*, the judgments to be inflicted upon the *ten tribes* occupy the foreground,—"that sinful kingdom" (which does not at the same time apply to Judah) being destined to irrevocable destruction, ix. 8, because the gradually increasing chastisements inflicted on her have been in vain, iv. 6–11, vii. 1–9, while only a state of extreme depression is predicted, ix. 11, concerning Judah. On the other hand, Hos. ii. 2 seems, though the meaning of the passage has been disputed, to assume the rejection of Judah also. And after the catastrophe of Samaria fails to have the effect of leading Judah to repentance, prophecy announces henceforth the ruin of the kingdom of Judah, the destruction of the temple, the desolation of the land, and the captivity of the people, the locality of which is first designated as Babylon in Mic. iv. 10, Isa. xxxix. 6 sq. Judgment being the abrogation of the covenant relation between God and His people, it was inflicted (as we saw, § 89, on the doctrine of retribution) in the form of expulsion from the Holy Land (to which the theocratic vocation of Israel is united), the abolition of worship by the withdrawal of the shekhina from the desecrated sanctuary, and the cessation of the theocratic government. Israel was to abide many days without a king, without a prince, and without a sacrifice, Hos. iii. 4, and to eat polluted bread among the heathen, ix. 4, comp. also Lam. ii. 6 sq.

(1) Comp. the remarks, §§ 44, 47, on the connection between holiness and righteousness.

(2) "A day of trouble and distress, . . . a day of darkness and gloominess," etc., Zeph. i. 15 sq. This day is ever drawing nearer, therefore woe to the workers "who desire the day of the Lord! . . . it is darkness and not light," Amos v. 18.

(3) Comp. the prophecy of Amos, ch. i. sq. (§ 176). The precedence here given to the judgment upon the heathen nations is intended to awaken the reflection: If God thus punishes the heathen for their transgressions against His people, how will he not punish the rebellion of His own people?

(4) For the captivity of Judah, Joel iii. 1, and the dispersion of Israel among the heathen, seem to refer only to that partial captivity and dispersion which in the days of this prophet had already commenced (comp. § 180).

§ 221.

The Judgment upon the Heathen Nations.

The judgment inflicted upon His covenant people is held up by the Lord as a warning to the *heathen*. Jehovah, as Judge of His people, is a witness against the heathen, Mic. i. 2. Comp. also as chief passage, Jer. xxv. 29 sqq.: "Do I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and should ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished, for I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth." And then is described the manner in which evils shall pursue one nation after another like a whirlwind, until the slain shall lie from one end of the earth to the other. The judgment inflicted on the heathen is (as we have already seen, § 219) frequently so connected with that poured out upon Israel, that the arrogance with which the heathen, as the Lord's Instruments, have treated Israel, the contempt which they have even shown for Israel's God, is represented as calling forth the Divine vengeance. The chief passage in this respect is Isa. x. 5 sqq. (§ 219, note 5); comp. also especially Obad. 15 sq. and other passages.

The view of the several prophets concerning the judgments upon the heathen world is fashioned according to the historical perspective imposed upon each by contemporary events. The earliest description is found in Joel, ch. iii. All the nations (כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם), by whom, however, as the context shows, the prophet chiefly means the neighboring peoples (Philistines, Phœnicians, Edomites), who have all along injured Judah, are summoned to the final judgment in the valley of Jehoshaphat. The nations themselves, indeed, are unacquainted with this Divine counsel, Mic. iv. 12 (1). Their purpose is, according to Joel iii. 9 sqq., by summoning all their forces, to give a final blow to the covenant people, and in this great effort they transform into weapons even the implements of peace. By the symbolical name, "valley of Jehoshaphat" (valley where Jehovah judges), the prophet undoubtedly means the valley which subsequently received this name from this very passage, viz. the Kedron valley, which runs between the Mount of Olives and the Temple Mount, and afterward turns in a south-easterly direction toward the Dead Sea (2). The fact that the nations are assembled in the immediate vicinity of the temple indicates, as Hengstenberg correctly explains it, that the judgment is an outflow of the theocracy; that the nations of the world are punished in the last judgment, not on account of their trangressions against natural law, but for the

position they occupy toward the covenant people, and consequently toward the God of revelation (3). While then Amos, whose opening sentence, i. 2, connects his prophecy with Joel iii. 16, divides this general judgment into many acts of national judgment, Isaiah again, xxiv.–xxvii. (4), sets before us a representation of a general judgment of the world, without any definite historical connection, except that a return from Assyrian captivity being spoken of, xxvii. 13, the standpoint of the Assyrian period is adhered to. That a judgment in the heavenly world of spirits is here placed in connection with the judgment of the worldly powers, who are, xxvii. 1, designated by symbolical names, has been already pointed out (§ 199, but see note there in brackets). On the other hand, prophecy, even in the Assyrian period, points onward beyond Assyria to *Babylon*, the power which, after being used as an instrument of judgment against Judah, is itself to be the object of an act of general judgment. Thus in Isa. xiii., the day of Babylon's destruction is, according to ver. 9 sqq., the day which is to make the earth desolate, and to destroy the sinners thereof out of it; the day on which, ver. 13, the Lord will shake the heavens and move the earth out of its place. Habakkuk also, ch. ii., beholds the knowledge of the glory of the Lord overwhelming all earthly greatness as the waters cover the sea, ver. 14, after the overthrow of the Chaldean conqueror. In Jeremiah, too, the series of announcements of judgments upon the nations closes with the magnificent prediction of the fall of Babylon, ch. l. sq. Among other nations, it is Edom which is especially brought forward by the prophets as an object of judgment (comp. Jer. xlix. 7 sqq., which takes up the former prophecy of Obadiah, and Isa. xxxiv., lxiii. 1–6, Ezek. xxxv.), as a type of those nations of heathendom whose origin and the course of whose history had placed them nearest to the kingdom of God, but who had only opposed that kingdom with the more deadly hatred (5).

The fall of Babylon is not, however, contemporaneous with the end of this dispensation, and accordingly the history of the world goes on, and with it the judgment of the world still proceeds (6). In the first place, the remarkable prophecy of Ezekiel, ch. xxxviii. sq., concerning Gog from the land of Magog, who (בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים), xxxviii. 16, comes with mighty hosts (עַם מַאֲסֵף גּוֹג, ver. 12), to which the nations of both Asia and Africa contribute, against the Holy Land (4), where the entire army perishes by its mutual animosities, reaches far beyond the fall of Babylon. At any rate, Gog can by no means, as Ewald supposes, signify Babylon, to which the prophecies of Ezekiel do not in general relate. The prophetic intuition is here, on the contrary, extended to the utmost limits of heathendom, for the purpose of impressing the thought that, before the end comes, all the rest of the world will also have attempted to resist the kingdom of God. For this reason, too, it is that Ezekiel's prediction is made use of, Rev. xx. 8, in the description of the last conflict against the Holy City. This prediction of judgment is then taken up by the *post-Babylonian* prophets. First, Haggai, ch. ii. 21 sq., shortly before the Persian wars, announces, but without definitely connecting the prediction with any one secular power, that shaking of the heavens and the earth which is to precede the establishment of the kingdom of God, and in which the Lord will overthrow the throne of kingdoms and destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen, in such wise that every one shall fall by the sword of his brother. Here, as in Ezek. xxxviii. 21, we again meet with the idea, embod-

ied in earlier historical occurrences, Judg. vii. 22, 2 Chron. xx. 22 sq., that the powers of the κόσμος are to consume each other, to prepare for the triumphant progress of the kingdom of God (7). The passages in Zech. xii.–xiv., especially ch. xiv., are still more closely connected with the prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gog, and at the same time carry on still further that of Joel (8). All the nations of the earth are assembled to fight against Jerusalem; the rulers and inhabitants of Jerusalem are endowed with marvellous power; but the conflict is a terrible one; the Holy City is taken, and half of the people are carried into captivity. When things, however, have come to the worst, Jehovah appears with all His saints upon the Mount of Olives for the deliverance of His people. This day of decision is a day of terrible darkness; but after the enemies, panic-stricken by God, have now also helped to exterminate each other, the light of redemption shall dawn on the evening of this last day of the present dispensation. Here again the thought is impressed that the Church will have to endure not merely a judicial sifting, like that announced by Malachi, ch. iii. 2, 18, to those of his contemporaries who were thirsting after an infliction of judgments upon the heathen, but an extremity of tribulation, in which it will seem to have perished.

We close this survey of Old Testament prophecy concerning the judgment of the world, with Daniel's prophecy of the four kingdoms. According to ch. ii. and vii., the history of the world is to run its course in four kingdoms. The unity of these kingdoms, *i.e.* the fact that each of them represents the κόσμος as opposed to the kingdom of God, is pointed out in ch. ii. by the colossal image which these kingdoms together compose, in ch. vii. by the circumstance of their successively arising from the ocean, tossed and disturbed by the four winds, the symbol of the storm-tossed heathen world. The worldly power is destroyed at a blow by the kingdom of God coming from heaven. We cannot here more particularly discuss these four kingdoms. Not to mention utterly untenable views, it will always be a matter of dispute whether to adopt the traditional interpretation, still advocated by Hengstenberg, Reichel, Hofmann, and others, which makes these to embrace the Chaldean, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman empires (9), or the now more usual one (of Delitzsch among others), which makes the fourth kingdom the Grecian, and explains the others variously—mostly, however, regarding the second as the Median, the third as the Persian. Of special importance, however, is that feature in these delineations of judgment, vii. 8, 11, 20 sq., 25, which represents the arrogance of the secular power and its hostility to the kingdom of God as at last concentrated in a king who, with a mouth speaking great things, blasphemes the Most High, and proceeds to destroy His worship and exterminate His saints, etc.; who then for a period obtains power over the saints of the Most High, until the final judgment takes place and involves him in destruction, vii. 22, 26, etc. That evil, too, will inwardly come to maturity before the final judgment, is the thought which is here more distinctly expressed than before. Ch. xi. 6 sees a preliminary historical embodiment of this view in Antiochus Epiphanes; and thus the Maccabean persecution, which contributed to the purification of the people, becomes a type of the last tribulation of the church, xii. 1, which shall be such as never was since there was a nation, but which shall conduce to the purification and preservation of the church, ver. 10 (10).

(1) Mic. iv. 12 : The heathen who rejoice over the fall of Zion "know not the thoughts of the Lord, neither understand His counsel, that He has gathered them as sheaves into the floor."

(2) For it is from Zion, according to Joel iii. 16, that the roaring of the judgment proceeds. On the other hand, many expositors understand here the valley in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, which was rendered illustrious by the proceedings of King Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xx. (§ 179). This valley was, according to ver. 26 of this chapter, called after this occurrence עֵמֶק בְּרָכָה (valley of blessing). [Orelli, p. 238, would make it another valley in the vicinity of Jerusalem, which then bore the name of Jehoshaphat.] The name יְהוֹשָׁפָט can, however, hardly be derived from King Jehoshaphat, but is *symbolical;* whence we find עֵמֶק הֶחָרוּץ, Joel iii. 14.

(3) Only we must not, in this delineation of judgment with its local and geographical limitations, regard the prophet's meaning as merely allegorical. It is the Old Testament form of thought which is also found in the New Testament, Matt. xxiv. 14, when it is declared that before the final judgment "the gospel of the kingdom must be preached in the whole *οἰκουμένη* for a *witness* unto all nations."

(4) [On these chapters comp. Orelli, p. 335 sq.]

(5) [The view that the prophecy of Obadiah is dependent upon that of Jeremiah (*e.g.* Hitzig) is decidedly to be rejected, because in the former we find none of the peculiar diction of the latter, and because the Book of Obadiah is closely connected, while in Jeremiah, on the contrary, breaks occur in the line of thought. This independence of Obadiah, demonstrated by Caspari, is recognized by Graf, Strack, and Orelli. Obadiah appears to have prophesied not long after the event recorded in 2 Chron. xxi. 8–10, but whether before Joel (Delitzsch, and most recently Orelli) or after him cannot with certainty be determined.]

(6) It is assumed in this prophetic picture that Israel is again dwelling in the Holy Land.

(7) [On Gog and Magog, comp. Orelli, p. 416 sq., also his art. "Gog and Magog" in Herzog, and Kautzsch's art. "Magog" in Riehm. "In the far-seeing gaze of prophecy it is an idle question, what nations or events of his own age the prophet in his description had in view. Even if the remembrance of the irruption of the Scythians under Josiah may have affected his description, the mention of the Ethiopians, etc. shows what the prophet had in mind. Magog, along with the others, is a type of the heathen nations in the ends of the earth, where, after the overthrow of Israel, neighboring enemies for the last time gather the forces of heathenism for an onset upon the people of God (Kautzsch).]

(8) [The authorship of Zech. xii.–xiv. is not attributed to the post-exilic Zechariah by the most recent writers, and is placed by Steiner (in Hitzig's *Kommentar*) and Orelli (p. 387 sq.) in the last period of Solomon's temple. The latter appeals to the mention of the false prophets and of idol worship in the prophecy. But the mention of false prophets agrees also with the post-exilic times (comp. § 192). Nothing certainly is said of idolatry after the exile, but in the numerous marriages with heathen wives there was reason to fear that idolatrous worship would again creep in. In respect to the assumption that Ezekiel used these chapters, the converse may justly be maintained.—The reference of their authorship to a prophet who lived after the exile, and therefore probably to Zechariah, is still the only correct one.]

(9) A view which, if we confine ourselves to ch. ii. and xii., may not only be justified, but also offers in every respect a more natural explanation of the separate details, but against which serious difficulties arise as we read further.

(10) How far the last judgment extends to the dead also, and how far prophetic eschatology in Daniel prepares the way for the doctrine of eternal condemnation, will be shown, § 226, in connection with the doctrine of the resurrection, § 226.

SECOND SUBDIVISION.

THE FUTURE REDEMPTION (1).

I. THE DELIVERANCE AND RESTORATION OF THE COVENANT PEOPLE.

§ 222.

The Restoration of Israel a Necessary Event.

The restoration of Israel, as before remarked, is not founded upon any claim that can be advanced by this people (comp. § 202), *but solely upon the nature of their God as the Holy and Faithful One.* When Israel incurred the Divine judgment, the Divine purpose of redemption seemed to be frustrated. In the opinion of the heathen, and even of unbelievers in Israel itself, it was over with the nation, and hence the glory of its God had come to naught; He had shown Himself to be a weak God. Thus the judgment upon Israel, which was to manifest Him to the heathen as the Holy One, had produced the opposite result. This is thus expressed, *e.g.* Ezek. xxxvi. 20 sq.: Israel being cast out among the heathen, profaned God's name among them, for they said, "These are the people of the Lord, and yet they are gone forth out of His land." Therefore, as ver. 22 sqq. further declares, Jehovah, to sanctify His great name, that the heathen may know Him to be the true God, must put a stop to judgment, and cancel the rejection of Israel. That which is here and in other passages (comp. Deut. xxxii. 27, Isa. xlviii. 9 sqq.) represented as an *event necessary to the preservation of the honor of the true God*, appears elsewhere as rather the *result of His nature.* For the idea of God as the absolutely unchangeable Being requires, as was shown, Pt. I., that the people with whom He has entered into a covenant relation cannot perish; comp. especially the passage Mal. iii. 6, discussed § 39, with note 5. As Jehovah, He is the *Faithful One*, whose words of promise, given to the fathers of the nation who found favor in His sight, shall stand for ever, while all that is earthly shall perish, Isa. xl. 7 sq. (2). His faithfulness cannot be made void by the unfaithfulness of man. He has not given a writing of divorcement to the adulterous wife, for this is the meaning of the profound passage, Isa. l. 1 (3), already mentioned (§ 188) in another connection; and hence there is no need that He should renew the covenant relation. For *their iniquities* the people are sold, but He is able to overcome and do away with sin (Mic. vii. 18 sq. (4), Isa. xlii. 25). Nay, the Divine judgment of rejection is to have the effect of causing the whole power of the Divine love to shine forth (5); comp. Jer. xxxi. 2 sq., 20, Hos. xi. 8 sq., Isa. xlix. 14 sqq. (6), liv. 7–10, and other passages. *But how does this love deliver?* How does it come to pass that Israel, though judged, is still delivered? that God's calling, which is to remain unchangeable, attains its end in this very nation, which has shown itself incapable of fulfilling its vocation? The answer is,—1. *God so arranges that a restoration of this nation is possible;* and 2. *He so restores the nation as to make it a fit instrument for the accomplishment of His purposes of redemption.*

(1) The future redemption is represented as embracing,—1. *The deliverance and restoration of the rejected covenant people* in which even the just who have fallen asleep are to participate by the *resurrection*. 2. The *introduction* of those *heathen* who have been saved from judgment *into the kingdom of God* by means of the restored covenant people. 3. The prophecies concerning redemption culminate in the appearance of *the Messiah*.

(2) Isa. xl. 7 sq : "Surely the people is grass : the grass withereth, the flower fadeth ; but the word of our God shall stand for ever."

(3) Isa. l. 1 : "Thus saith the Lord, Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement whom I have put away ? or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you ? Behold, for *your iniquities* have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away." The first half of the verse is explained by the law, Deut. xxiv. 3 sq. (§ 104. 2). This law certainly applies to Israel, inasmuch as repudiated Israel could not, see Jer. iii. 1, of its own power restore the covenant relation. But to God such restoration was not impossible, for it was not He but Israel that had cancelled the covenant. Neither had He given up His claim upon the nation He had rejected.

(4) Mic. vii. 18 sq. : "Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of His heritage ?" (for those are the acts which manifest God's incomparableness). "He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy. He will turn again, He will have compassion upon us, He will subdue our iniquities ; and Thou wilt cast all their sins into the the depths of the sea." (Comp. § 202.)

(5) Compare how, as remarked, Pt. I. (§ 29), the first breach of the covenant on the part of the people, Ex. xxxiv. 6 sq., led to the first disclosure of the grace and compassion of God.

(6) The people exiled and wandering, take with them as a legacy the saying, Jer. xxxi. 2 sq. : "I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee." Hos. xi. 8 sq. : "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim ? how shall I deliver thee, Israel ? how shall I make thee as Admah ? how shall I set thee as Zeboim ?" (*i.e.* utterly exterminate thee). "Mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together," etc. (comp. § 44). Isa. xlix. 14 sqq. : "Zion said, The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb ? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee."

§ 223.

The Remnant of Jacob. The New Covenant an everlasting one. The Forgiveness of Sins. The Outpouring of the Spirit.

1. *God's judgments have a purpose, and therefore a measure*, as taught by Isaiah in the profound parable, ch. xxviii. 24 sqq. (1), already quoted § 90. When God inflicts judgments on the covenant people, His motive is not to annihilate them, like Sodom and Gomorrah, but to correct them with judgment (יִסַּר בְּמִשְׁפָּט), Jer. x. 24, xxx. 11, *i.e.* in due measure, Isa. xxvii. 8 (according to the probable explanation of בְּסַאסְּאָהּ), which measure is imposed by the Divine holiness ; see as chief passage, Hos. xi. 8 sq. According to this measure, judgment is so inflicted upon Israel that they are preserved therein. But how, it may be asked, is this possible ? And here we meet with the important prophetic doctrine of the שְׁאֵרִית יַעֲקֹב (שְׁאָר יַעֲקֹב, etc.) *the remnant of Jacob*. While the mass of the nation became rebellious, individuals maintained their fidelity, like the seven thousand in the kingdom of the ten tribes who in Elijah's time had not bowed the knee to

Baal, 1 Kings xix. 18. In these faithful ones, this *ecclesia invisibilis* of the old covenant, we have a pledge that the people of God shall not perish ; comp. as chief passage, Isa. viii. 17 sq., where Isaiah brings forward himself and his sons as signs and examples in the sense here designated (2). The intercession of these servants of God procures a longer exemption from judgment for the people ; comp. *e.g.* Amos vii. 1–6. But even when they can effect nothing further, Jer. xvi. 1, the just must themselves be preserved, Ezek. xiv. 14–20 : it must be verified in them that the just lives through his faith, Hab. ii. 4 (3). Though Israel be sifted among all nations as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall no grain fall to the earth, according to the well-known passage, Amos ix. 9 (4). Or though Israel, according to another image, be felled like a tree, there still remains for a stock "a holy seed," Isa. vi. 13 (5). For the sake of this seed of His servants, God will not exterminate Israel ; comp. as chief passage, Isa. lxv. 8 sq. This remnant, Isaiah declares, ch. x. 21, shall return, this remnant of Jacob, to the mighty God (6). This remnant is, as Zeph. iii. 12 says, a humble and poor people, who trust in the name of the Lord. Comp. also the שְׁאֵרִית of Mic. ii. 12, v. 6, Jer. xxiii. 3. Thus is Israel preserved in the midst of judgment ; judgment effects the sifting of the people.

2. In this restored remnant, the stock of the new church, the Divine counsel is to attain its end, and that for ever. *The new covenant is everlasting.* "I will betroth thee to me for ever," Hos. ii. 19. It is, Isa. liv. 8 sq., with an everlasting kindness, as unalterable as the Noachian covenant, that the Lord has mercy on His people ; nay, though the mountains depart and the hills be removed, *i.e.* though all that is most stable be overthrown, this covenant of peace shall not be removed ; comp. Jer. xxxi. 35–37, l. 5, Isa. xli. 8, Ezek. xvi. 60, and other passages. And what is the *pledge* of this stability ? The fact that in the new covenant, God does not merely demand, but *effects that nature in His people, in virtue of which they are now fitted for their vocation* (7). This restoration of the people does not indeed take place in a magical manner ; it becomes possible on their part through deep *repentance* for former sins, and a zealous return to their God, Deut. xxx. 2 ; comp. especially (with regard to the ten tribes) Jer. xxxi. 19. Hence it is that, when the Divine summons penetrates the lands of their captivity, the rejected ones hasten with trembling, lest their deliverance should be delayed, Hos. xi. 10 sq. (iii. 5), and return with weeping and supplications, Jer. xxxi. 9, l. 4 sq. The Divine *forgiveness* corresponds with the repentance of the people, and is complete. The adulteress becomes the bride of God, as though she had never been unfaithful, "like a wife of youth," Isa. liv. 6 ; "that thou mayest never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all thou hast done, saith the Lord God," Ezek. xvi. 63. The fact that God thus *restores* the people to the same relation to Himself, is *their righteousness from Him*, צִדְקָתָם מֵאִתִּי, Isa. liv. 17, δικαιοσύνη ἐκ Θεοῦ. This state of grace of the redeemed church is maintained against all their accusers : every tongue, it is said in the same verse, that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. Thus the people are all righteous (צַדִּיקִים), Isa. lx. 21. But this righteousness of grace, which thus abolishes sin, becomes also a *righteousness of life*, a new vital principle being implanted in the church by the *outpouring of the Divine Spirit.* The new church is a *spiritual* church, comp. Isa. xliv. 3, lix. 21, Ezek. xxxix. 29. Even

in the Old Testament theocracy, the guidance of the Holy Spirit was given (Isa. lxiii. 11 "he that put his Holy Spirit within him"), but His guidance was the prerogative of the organs of the theocracy, especially of the prophets, and then certainly of the pious in general. But such guidance was effected only by an influence and not by an indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and even in the prophets this influence was an extraordinary endowment (§ 65, 204). The church of the future, on the contrary, is founded upon an outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh, Joel ii. 28 sq. כָּל-בָּשָׂר is not indeed the whole world of mankind, the πᾶσα σάρξ of John xvii. 2; but it is declared, by the enumeration which follows of sons and daughters, old men and young men, servants and handmaids, that no age or station is excluded from the possession of the Spirit. Indeed, this outpouring of the Spirit is represented as causing all to prophesy. That direct personal communion with God which is effected by the Spirit, and which afforded the prophets an insight into the Divine counsels, is to become the common possession of all members of the church; and thus is to be fulfilled that desire of Moses, expressed Num. xi. 29 (8). With this agree also the passages Jer. xxxi. 34, where it is said of the church of the new covenant, "They shall no more teach every man his neighbor, . . . saying, Know the Lord," etc. (§ 209); and Isa. liv. 13: "All thy children shall be לִמּוּדֵי יְהוָה, the taught of the Lord." This teaching of God under the new covenant, confirmed as it is by the passages John vi. 45, 1 John ii. 20, 27, which again take up these prophetic utterances, has, as is notorious, been explained by fanatics as excluding human instruction, and abolishing a learned order in the church of the new covenant. But these passages are not intended to do away with human means for obtaining a knowledge of saving truth, but to proclaim the *independence of human authority* enjoyed by each member of the church with respect to his *assurance of salvation*. They promise that Divine truth shall be directly testified to by the Holy Spirit in each member of this church. Hengstenberg, on Jer. xxxi. 34, very aptly refers in elucidation to 2 Cor. iii. 3, where the διακονία, which brings about an appropriation of salvation, is expressly presupposed (9). This impartation of the Holy Spirit, besides communicating a vital knowledge of God, purifies the heart and creates a readiness to fulfil the Divine will, Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27, Jer. xxxi. 33 (10). And thus the end of the Old Testament educational work is attained; the holy people of God is also a subjectively holy church.

(1) Isa. xxviii. 24 sqq.: As the farmer does not always plough, but also sows, does not always thresh and so destroy the corn, but only so far as is required for obtaining bread, so does God proceed as Judge.

(2) In Isa. viii. 17, the prophet contrasts himself and his sons with the rebellious nation, which for its contempt of God's word is to be exposed to the approaching judgments of utter helplessness and hopelessness: "I wait for the Lord, that hideth His face from the house of Jacob, and hope in Him. *Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me for signs and emblems in Israel*, from the Lord of Hosts which dwelleth in Mount Zion." The sign is seen by many only in the symbolic names of Isaiah and his sons. This is not to be excluded; but still the main thought is, that they were themselves *personally* such signs and emblems.

(3) As it was verified to Jeremiah, to whom the Divine word came, xxxix. 18, at the destruction of Jerusalem: "Thy life shall be for a prey unto thee, because thou hast put thy trust in me."

(4) Amos. ix. 8 sq.: "Behold, the eyes of the Lord God are upon this sinful

kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord. (The sinful *kingdom*, the kingdom of Samaria, is to be destroyed, but this is by no means a destruction of the *house* of Israel.) For lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth."

(5) Isa. vi. 12 sq.: The Lord removes the men, "and great is the forsaking in the midst of the land. And if there is therein still a tenth, yet shall this also be consumed." But, continues the prophet, "as a teil tree, and as an oak, in which, when they are felled, a stock remains; the holy seed is their stock."

(6) Isa. x. 21: שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב שְׁאָר יַעֲקֹב אֶל-אֵל-גִּבּוֹר. Isaiah called one of his own sons שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב, comp. vii. 3, for a testimony against the ungodly and secure, who expected the deliverance of the entire nation, and for the comfort of the godly.

(7) Comp. what is said on Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq., in § 202.

(8) [It is quite in keeping with Wellhausen's view of the Old Testament that in his interpretation of the prophecy in Joel, ii. 28, he makes the "undoubtedly post-exilic writer" express in the passage the "ideal of the general drift of the law, which needs and tolerates no heroes" (i. p. 420).]

(9) 2 Cor. iii. 3: "Ye are an epistle of Christ ministered by us (*διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν*), written not with ink, but with the *Spirit* of the living God; not on tables of stone, but on fleshly tables of the heart."

(10) Jer. xxxi. 33: "I will put my law in their heart," etc. See what has already been said on this passage, § 202.

§ 224.

Other Features of the Times of Redemption.

The other features of the times of redemption are, according to prophetic intuition, the following:—

1. *The return of the people to the Holy Land, and the restoration of Jerusalem.* This point, recurring as it does in almost every prophecy of redemption, needs no special references (§ 23, note 3). The possession of the Holy Land is declared to be a perpetual one, from Joel iii. 20 and Amos ix. 15 onward (1), with increase of territory, Obad. 17 sqq. (2).

2. *The reunion of the twelve tribes.* It would be a grievous misfortune for the nation that one tribe of Israel should be lost, comp. Judg. xxi. 3, 6; and the disruption of the theocracy was a consequence and a punishmeut of sin (3). Hence there can be no complete redemption for Israel without the reunion of the ten tribes and of Judah under one head; see Hos. ii. 2, iii. 5, Isa. xi. 13 (4). This point is, however, most fully treated in the prophecy of Ezekiel, xxxvii. 15–22, where the matter is presented in a visible manner by the symbolical act of joining two sticks, which were probably formed from the trunk of a vine split lengthwise (5).

3. By reason of the causal connection between sin and *evil*, the restoration of the people being a deliverance from sin, is at the same time the abolition of evil in all respects—*an abolition of all the troubles of life.* The ordinances of the ancient theocracy were calculated to exhibit an outwardly consecrated nation, in order to make the people conscious (in virtue of that tuition of the law which pointed from the external to the internal), by its demands of an outward purity, of their need of the sanctification of the inner man (§ 84). Now, however, the process was re-

versed,—the sanctification of the inner life effected by the Holy Spirit was to press outward, and manifest itself in a perfect purification and consecration of even the most ordinary affairs of life. Thus, to give a few examples, the difficult passage Jer. xxxi. 38 sqq. so describes the boundaries of the new Jerusalem, that all the unclean places of the ancient city are now sacred places (6). So, too, Zech. xiv. 20 sq. expresses the thought that holiness is to penetrate even to that which is most external; that while, under the sway of sin, all that was sacred was profaned, now, on the contrary, all that was profane shall be sacred. In that day קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה (the inscription on the high priest's diadem) shall stand even upon the bells of the horses, nay, the very cooking utensils in Jerusalem shall be holy (7). Among the troubles of life so frequently summed up in the Old Testament as the four chief evils (§ 89, note 5) which shall be abolished, *war* is especially mentioned. All weapons are to be destroyed, Isa. ii. 5, Mic. v. 4–10, Zech. ix. 10, etc.; the new church is unapproachable in its protected retirement, Mic. vii. 14; the new city of God is no more to be desecrated by enemies, Joel iii. 17. Peace is also to pervade *nature*. The harmony between it and man, which, according to Gen. iii., comp. § 72. 2, was disturbed by sin, is to be restored; the Holy Land is to be glorified, and a fountain of life to proceed from the temple, Joel iii. 18, Ezek. xlvii. 6 sqq. (8). Every blessing of heaven and earth is to be poured out upon the favored people; all that can harm them is to be done away with; comp. such descriptions as Hos. ii. 18 (9), 23 sq., Amos ix. 13 sq., Ezek. xxxiv. 25 sqq., etc. The nature of the wild beasts is to be changed, Isa. xi. 6–8 (10), comp. lxv. 25. But in all these pictures of the days of redemption we always perceive that such external renovation presupposes deliverance from sin and inward renewal. Thus Isa. xi., after describing the peace which is to prevail in the animal world, continues in ver. 9: "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (11). [Many of these expressions are evidently figurative.—D.]

(1) Joel iii. 20: "Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation." Amos ix. 15: "I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them."

(2) How differently would the prophets have spoken if they had regarded Canaan and Jerusalem in a merely allegorical sense!

(3) We have already (§ 92, note 1) spoken of the fact that the number of twelve tribes was essential to the normal condition of the theocracy.

(4) Isaiah announces, xi. 13, that in the times of redemption "the envy of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah be cut off."

(5) Ezek. xxxvii. 15–22. The prophet writes upon one stick, "For Judah and the children of Israel associated with him;" upon the other, "For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim and the whole house of Israel associated with him,"—and presses the two sticks together in his hand. The meaning of this act is stated ver. 21: "Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."

(6) Jer. xxxi. 38 sqq., it is said that at the rebuilding of Jerusalem the measuring line should go forth as far as the hill Gareb (*i.e.* of the leper), and turn toward Goath (perhaps as Hengstenberg thinks, from גָּוַע, to depart, to decease; then perhaps the place of execution); and the whole valley of the dead bodies and

of the ashes, and all the Sheremoth, to the brook of Kidron (certainly identical with the שְׁרֵמוֹת קִדְרוֹן, the fields of Kidron, 2 Kings xxiii.; these were, according to ver. 4, defiled by Josiah, who burned in them all the abominations of idolatry), were to be holy to the Lord. This has certainly a symbolical meaning, but must not be regarded, as by Hengstenberg (*Christol.* ii. p. 448), as being in the intention of the prophet only an image of the triumph of God's kingdom over the world. [It will be noticed that the author understands שְׁרֵמוֹת (Sheremoth) to be an error of copyists for שְׂדֵמוֹת (A. V. *fields*) : so the Keri, and Mühlau and Volck, Lex.—D.]

(7) It is further said, Zech. xiv. 20 sq., that the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar ; and every pot in Jerusalem and Judah shall be holiness for the Lord of Hosts, and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them and seethe therein. In the Mosaic worship the pots in the temple were less holy than the bowls, for the laity sacrificed in the former, while the priest sprinkled the sacrificial blood with the latter. This distinction is now abolished, as is also the distinction between vessels for worship and for secular purposes, because all the relations of life are now equally hallowed by God.

(8) Ezek. xlvii. 6 sqq. : Waters issue forth from the threshold of the temple in the east ; these waters run into the Dead Sea, and make its waters wholesome. (See Neumann, *Das Wasser des Lebens ein exeget. Versuch über Ezek.* xlvii. 1–12, 1848.) [Keil, in the second edition of his Commentary, appealing to Isa. xii. 3 and xliv. 3, interprets the river in a spiritual sense. The figure of the brook issuing from under the threshold of the temple and becoming constantly larger symbolizes the thought "that the salvation which the Lord causes to flow down from His throne to His people would from small beginnings become wonderfully increased." On the contrary, Orelli (p. 422) agrees with the view in the text—a blessed land, a garden like Eden, in place of the previous desolation, encircles the Sanctuary.]

(9) Hos. ii. 18 : The Lord makes in that day a covenant with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and the creeping things of the ground, that they shall not hurt Israel.

(10) Isa. xi. 6 sq. : "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, . . . and the lion shall eat straw like the ox." This description must not be regarded, as by older theologians, as mere allegory. [Still, it is evidently figurative.—D.]

(11) Comp. Isa. xxxiii. 24 : "The inhabitant shall not say, I am sick : the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity."

§ 225.

Death destroyed.

The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, in which the penalty inflicted on mankind for sin culminates. The voice of weeping shall be no more heard in the new Jerusalem (Isa. lxv. 19). Yet in this very passage, vers. 20–23, human life is only supposed to be of greater length, perhaps such as Genesis ascribes to primeval times. There shall be no more an infant who attains but a few days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days : he that dies at a hundred years dies a youth, and a sinner is carried off at a hundred years, and men are to live as long as trees. Here, then, a *limitation of the power of death* is spoken of, and also sin is still represented as possible. On the other hand, prophecy rises in some passages to a declaration of *the annihilation of death, and of a resurrection of the dead* (1). To understand, however, the *position of this announcement in the doctrinal system of the Old Testament*, we must deal more particularly with the subject. The ultimate grounds

on which the prophetic doctrine of the resurrection rests are, *first*, the knowledge of the *living God*, who has power even over death and the regions of the dead, Deut. xxxii. 39, 1 Sam. ii. 6 (2) ; and proves that He has this power in those cases in which He recalls the dead to life at the request of His prophets. It rests, *secondly*, upon the importance of *human personality*, which is called to communion with God (see § 79). Still it is not of the vanquishing of death in the cases of individuals that prophecy chiefly treats, but of the eternal duration of the church. This is guaranteed by the eternity of God, who is an inexhaustible source of life even to His perishing people (Isa. xl. 28 sqq.). When the heavens wax old as doth a garment, and are changed as a vesture, He remains *the same*, and therefore the seed of His servants shall outlast these changes of the universe (Ps. cii. 27 sqq.). And this very fact, that the Church rises again in renewed vigor after apparent destruction, is also represented as her resurrection from death. This is done first in two passages of Hosea, *viz.* vi. 2 and xiii. 14. In the former, the people are introduced as turning to God in their hour of need, and saying, though still in a hesitating manner, "After two days He will *revive* us, in the third" (*i.e.* after a short delay) "He will *raise us up*, and we shall live before Him." That which is here expressed as the hope of the people, the fulfilment of which cannot be promised in their present state of inconstancy, appears in the second passage as a saying of God. The very variously understood train of ideas from ver. 12 onward is as follows : The afflictions of Israel are to be the pangs by which a new nation shall be born. But the people will not suffer this to come to pass. "They are as an unwise son ; when the time is come, he does not enter the place of the breaking forth of children." The anxiety for both mother and child, when it does not come to the birth, forms the transition to ver. 14 : "I will ransom them from the power of the grave ; I will redeem them from death. O death, where are thy plagues ? O grave, where is thy destruction ?" As much as to say, And yet this people have a God who is capable of delivering them from even such a state of death, because the powers of death cannot prevail against Him (3). Since, however, the people resist their deliverance, it is also added that the storm of judgment shall sweep them away. Hence the victory over death here spoken of is merely hypothetical, and assumed to pertain to the church in general (4).

(1) Comp. my *Commentationes ad theol. bibl. pertinentes*, p. 42 sqq., and my article *Unsterblichkeit*, *Lehre des A. T.*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xxi. p. 416 sqq. [Also Kübel, art. "Aufersterhung" in Herzog, 2d ed.] Prophecy confirms the old doctrine of Sheol, as appears from the passages formerly given (§ 78 sq.).

(2) Deut. xxxii. 39 : "I kill, and I make alive." 1 Sam. ii. 6 : "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive ; He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up."

(3) According, indeed, to another explanation (so Simson, and an article in the *Zeitschr. für Protest. und Kirche*, 1854, xxviii. p. 124), Hos. xiii. 14 would have an entirely different meaning, its first sentence being regarded as a question : "Should I ransom them from the power of death ?" the second as an expression of God's extreme wrath with the people, against whom death and hell are summoned ("Come with all your powers of destruction"). But such an explanation of the first sentence is as unnatural as it is improbable that אֱהִי is to be understood otherwise than in ver. 5. I rejoice to find that Keil has returned to the old interpretation [in agreement with Hitzig-Steiner and Orelli, p. 268 sqq., while Böhl (*Christologie des A. T.*, p. 198) understands the death as spiritual death which they experience in exile].

(4) The saying, however, points significantly to an actual conquest of death and the region of the dead; hence its citation, 1 Cor. xv. 55.

§ 226.

Continuation.

The following considerations will show the *further progress of this doctrine.* When Israel is restored and glorified in its remnant delivered out of judgments, one enigma will nevertheless remain unsolved. The just shall live by his faith, Hab. ii. 2; hence, when judgment is inflicted, all the just are, according to Ezek. ix. 4, to be distinguished by a mark from the multitudes who are delivered up to the destroying angels (1). And yet the same prophet, xxi. 3, 8 sq., beholds the fire of judgment consuming both green trees and dry, the sword of the Lord slaying both the righteous and the wicked. Where, then, is the God of righteousness? This contradiction, in which the Divine righteousness seems involved, is in some degree relieved by the consideration that God takes the righteous to their rest, that they may not experience the woes about to be inflicted, Isa. lvii. 1 sq.: "He enters into peace; they rest in their beds who walked straight onward" (so King Josiah, 2 Kings xxii. 20). But this does not solve the enigma. Its full solution can only be furnished by the participation of the righteous who have departed in faith in the promises of God, the redemption of their nation, and the consummation of that kingdom of God for which they waited. And here the prophecy Isa. xxvi. comes in. The prophet had already, in xxv. 8, declared, when speaking of the times of redemption, that the Lord would for ever annihilate death, and wipe away tears from all faces. This implied, in the first place, only the abolition of death for the church of that period; but in xxvi. 19 the prophecy goes further. The train of ideas in this variously explained chapter is, from ver. 13 onward, as follows (2):—The people formerly served other gods, not, as many explain it, other human lords; this idolatrous generation (not: that race of tyrants) is judged, and will not rise again from the dead. Jehovah has again increased the nation, but its full redemption, by means of the travail-pains it is enduring, has not yet come. The inhabitants of the world "will not be born," *i.e.*, according to the context, wrested from the realm of the dead (3). Hence the wish, ver. 19, that the dead of God (4), the corpses of the people, may arise; which wish quickly passes into the summons," "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs" (or, according to others, of the light); *i.e.*, as dew revives the herbage, so does the power of God revive thee, and the earth brings forth the shades (the dead). Till then the people are to wait quietly. On the day of the final judgment for which the Lord arises (ver. 21), the earth discloses her blood, and no more covers her slain (5); these being, according to the most probable explanation, awakened to new life, obtain their justification. That the resurrection (ver. 19) must not here be regarded as typical (as though only the deliverance of the people of God from their troubles were intended), is evident from the contrast in ver. 12 and the whole context (6). Advancing to still later prophecy, we first meet with Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones, ch. xxxvii. (7). The prophet is led in the Spirit into a valley filled with dry bones. To the Lord's question, "Son of man, will these

bones live?" he replies, "Lord God, Thou knowest;" thus declaring the matter to be beyond human knowledge. He then receives the command to prophecy over the bones, ver. 4 sq. (8). A noise is now heard, and there is a shaking (9); next follows a reanimation through the agencies there indicated, the bones first approaching each other and becoming covered with sinews and flesh, and then the breath of life coming from the four winds into these slain, when they stand up reanimated, an exceeding great army. "These bones," it is now said, vers. 11–14, "are the whole house of Israel (10). Behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel; then ye shall know that I am the Lord: and I will put my Spirit in you that you may live, and I will place you in your own land," etc. From the times of the church fathers to the most recent expositors, it has been disputed whether the description in vers. 1–10 is to be understood literally of the resurrection of the dead, or symbolically of the restoration of the covenant people (10). According to the former view, it is not the explanation but only the application of the vision that is given in vers. 11–14 (11), which are said, as Calovius understood the passage, to indicate the analogy existing between the restoration of Israel and the future resurrection of the dead. But the simple meaning of the words requires that we should regard these verses as the *explanation* of the preceding vision; and since at least ver. 11 ("these bones are the whole house of Israel"), which declares the condition of Israel to be that of dry bones, must be symbolically understood, it seems quite arbitrary to take ver. 12, where it is declared to those who have said, Our bones are dried, "I will open your graves," etc., literally. In any case, however, the vision is of the greatest importance in the development of the doctrine of the resurrection, which, though not resulting therefrom as its direct explanation, is yet implied by its obvious *application*. Tertullian had already justly remarked concerning this passage: *de vacuo similitudo non competit; de nullo parabola non convenit.* That the power of God *can*, against all human thought and hope, reanimate the dead, is the general idea of the passage, from which consequently the hope of a literal resurrection of the dead may naturally be inferred, though the context shows that this is not what is here spoken of. The resurrection of the dead is, however, decidedly taught in Dan. xii. In ver. 1 the prophet foretells "a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation;" and continues: "At that time every one that is found written in the book" (*i.e.* the book of life) "shall be delivered, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt; and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Then it is said to Daniel, ver. 13, "Go thou thy way till the end; for thou shalt rest, and rise to thy lot at the end of the days." According to the connection of xii. 3 with xi. 33, 35, the promise of a resurrection to life (comp. Isa. xxvi. 19) is made especially with reference to those who have maintained their fidelity to God by a confessor's death. The expression "many," however, must not be taken in a partial sense (12). It is not used in opposition to those who do not rise, but merely as expressing a great number

(13). The resurrection of the *ungodly* first appears in Daniel, though the transition to it is formed by Isa. lxvi. 24. When it is there said of the corpses of the rebels, whom the Lord has punished by fire and sword (ver. 16), that they lie outside the city of God, suffering eternal torments, "their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh," it is evidently assumed that the corpses are still endued with sensation. In the passage in Daniel, xii. 2, the word דִּרָאוֹן is used, which occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament except in the passage in Isaiah; hence it is not improbable that the passage in Daniel refers to that in Isaiah. Daniel is speaking only of a resurrection of Israel, not of that of *all* men; the latter not being expressly mentioned in the Old Testament, though an allusion to it might be found in the formerly discussed passage (§ 199), Isa. xxiv. 22, where, as this obscure saying may be more particularly understood, a bringing forth of the kings still confined in the pit (*i.e.* in the region of the dead) is spoken of, while, on the other side, it is said of the Chaldeans in Jer. li. 39, 57, that they should sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake. These are, however, expressions which can scarcely be urged to establish a doctrine.

(1) Ezekiel most emphatically declares, ch. xviii., that every one shall be recompensed according to his righteousness.

(2) Isa. xxvi. 8–12: The prophet expresses, in the name of the righteous, their desire for the day when God's judgments shall fall upon the sinful world, that sinners may at length behold the greatness of the Lord and His zeal for His people. They desire, however, that He may send redemption to His people.

(3) תַּפִּיל in ver. 19 shows the proper sense of the word יִפְלוּ in Isa. xxvi. 18. Undoubtedly נֵפֶל is not *birth* in general, but *miscarriage*. The expression, however, implies a violent wresting. The event does not take place in the ordinary course of nature: the dead must be torn by force from the world below, and this the people were not capable of effecting.

(4) For thus must מֵתֶיךָ be understood (see Böttcher, *de inferis*, § 445), in opposition to the dead of the faithless generation. [So also Orelli, p. 339.]

(5) The connection with what precedes makes it probable that by הֲרוּגִים, in Isa. xxvi. 21, we must understand God's dead ones, mentioned ver. 18, whose blood, having been till now unavenged, is thus placed on a level with the blood of one put to death for his sins.

(6) Even ver. 21 does not merely signify that those who have been put to death when innocent are to take vengeance on their enemies at the last judgment.

(7) The occasion of the vision in Ezek. xxxvii. is alluded to in ver. 11. The people were sunk so low that they considered a restoration, such as the prophet announced in ch. xxxvi., absolutely inconceivable. It was to meet this despair that the revelation was given to the prophet.

(8) Ezek. xxxvii 4 sq.: "Ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord. Behold, I will cause breath (רוּחַ) to enter into you, that ye may live: and I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, that ye may live, and ye shall know that I am the Lord."

(9) According to Hitzig and Kliefoth, an earthquake (LXX σεισμός), which it is, however, purely arbitrary to identify with that of xviii. 19, in which the power of Gog is destroyed.

(10) By which some understand merely the revival of Israel from civil death to a new political existence, others its restoration from spiritual death, its spiritual revival,—a difference which may be reconciled by the fact that, according to xxxvi. 27 sq., and xxxvii. 21 sqq., the restoration of Israel as the people of God under the rule of the Messiah, of a truly sanctified community, is treated of. [Comp. Orelli,

p. 414 sq. : the vision promises "the awaking of the church from its present condition of external dissolution and internal estrangement from God, which to human view appeared utterly impossible."] After the almost exclusive adoption of the symbolical meaning in recent times, Hitzig and Kliefoth have again revived the literal acceptation. [But the most recent commentaries of Smend and Keil, 2d ed. adopt the symbolical interpretation.]

(11) Kliefoth, in his Commentary, i. p. 370, calls it "a consolatory address based upon the matter of the vision, and applying it to a definite point."

(12) According to the accentuation, the מִן before מִיְּשֵׁנֵי is dependent not upon רַבִּים but יָקִיצוּ. [So Orelli, p. 527, sq.]

(13) See especially Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 314, and *Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 598.

II. THE ADMISSION OF THE HEATHEN INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

§ 227.

The Extension of the Kingdom of God in the Times of Redemption.

The opposition of the heathen world to the divinely purposed kingdom of God, is subdued by the destructive judgment inflicted on it. But this judgment is to have also a positive result. When it is over, says Zeph. iii. 9, "I will turn to the people clean lips" (for their lips had been hitherto polluted by the invocation of idols), "that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one shoulder" (*i.e.* bear the same yoke). As, however, Israel is to be restored only in its sifted remnant, so also it is only the *remnant* of the heathen rescued from judgment who do homage to the Lord. כָּל־הַנּוֹתָר, it is said, Zech. xiv. 16, "Every one that is left of all the nations," these shall go up to worship before the Lord, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles. This thought is carried out by the prophets with respect also to a series of individual nations, viz. those who have shown themselves most hostile toward Israel, nay, whose reception among the covenant people was in Old Testament times forbidden by the law, Deut. xxiii. 4 (§ 82. 3). Comp. *e.g.* the predictions of Jeremiah concerning heathen nations—Moab, ch. xlviii. (1) ; and Ammon, xlix. 6 ; also the prophecy concerning the remnant of the Philistines, Zech. ix. 7 (וְנִשְׁאַר גַּם הוּא לֵאלֹהֵינוּ). To the intuition of the *older* prophets, this enlargement of the kingdom of God by the admission of the heathen is first of all *an extension of the theocracy* as it existed under David and Solomon, when heathen nations were subject to the sceptre of the theocratic king. This is shown particularly in the passage Amos ix. 11 sq. : "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof ; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen upon whom my name is named, saith the Lord that doeth this" (2). According to a now widely accepted explanation (Hitzig, Anger, and similarly Orelli), the last words are said to signify : upon whom my name was once called, *i.e.* as that of their conqueror. But the expression : The name of the Lord is named upon a people, never denotes this external possession by Him, but always a relation of internal fellowship ; comp. such passages as Deut. xxviii. 9 sq. (§ 56, note 4) ; and hence the *perfectum* נִקְרָא must be taken as the *futurum exactum*, as a declaration of the

position these nations will enter into with respect to the kingdom of God. (The admission, however, of the heathen nations into the kingdom of God is here expressed in a quite indefinite manner, the historical horizon of this prophet being still limited.) On the other hand, we are placed upon the heights of prophetic intuition in the descriptions of the latter days given Isa. ii. 2–4, and Mic. iv. 1–4. All nations are going to Zion, which is spiritually elevated above all the mountains of the world, to receive there the Divine law as the rule of their lives, while universal peace prevails under the rule of Jehovah (3). But it is especially in the Book of Isaiah, xl.–lxvi., that the mission of Israel as the servant of the Lord, to be the medium of revelation to all mankind, forms one of the fundamental thoughts. The עֶבֶד יְהוָה is *Israel as the covenant people*, xli. 8 sq., xliv. 1 sqq., comp. Jer. xxx. 10, xlvi. 27 sq., and in a twofold aspect: On the one hand, the nation as it actually appeared, the blind and deaf servant of the Lord, seeing many things but observing not, having open ears but hearing not, and for such unfaithfulness incurring judgment, and falling into a state of utter ruin, Isa. xlii. 18–25; on the other, the servant is Israel according to its ideal, as a nation true to its Divine calling (comp. Ps. xxiv. 6: Jacob = the generation of those who seek God's face), and in this respect differing from the nation as it actually appeared, though at the same time one with it. The figure, moreover, represents first the servants of God collectively, that שְׁאֵרִית יַעֲקֹב (§ 233. 1) from which the holy seed proceeds (see especially Isa. lxv. 8 sq.) which is to form the stock of the new church, and then culminates in an individual (see § 233). This servant, the ideal Israel, is accordingly called, according to xlii. 4, to establish judgment in the earth, and the isles wait for his law. He is the light of the Gentiles, ver. 6; through him the salvation of the Lord is to penetrate to the end of the earth, xlix. 6, comp. with li. 5. In these passages, as well as in ii. 2–4, it is to be remarked that the kingdom of God is now no longer to be extended, as in older prophecy, by force of arms, but by the *word*. While darkness still covers the earth, and gross darkness the nations, the glory of the Lord arises upon Zion, and nations and kings then walk in this light, ch. lx. etc. The new temple in Jerusalem is thus called a house of prayer for all nations, lvi. 7. The latter passage, lvi. 3–7, is also worthy of notice in another respect (4). It has already been remarked that the law, Deut. xxiii. 4, which excluded certain nations from the theocracy, was abrogated to prophetic intuition. But here the law, Deut. xxiii. 2, which excluded eunuchs from the kingdom of God, is also abolished, while that in ver. 3 of the same chapter, by which no מַמְזֵר was admitted into the church, is annulled (§ 82. 2) by Zech. ix. 6.

In this consummation of redemption, the theocratic relation in which Jehovah in Old Testament times stood to Israel, is transferred to all mankind. The Lord has become the *King* of all nations, Zech. xiv. 16 sq. (ver. 9), comp. with Isa. xxiv. 23, Ps. xcvi. 10, xcvii. 1 (Ps. xciii. 99, Obad. 21). All the treasures of the world, all the most precious possessions of the Gentiles, now conduce to the glory of the Divine kingdom, and are used for the adornment of the city and temple of God, etc.; comp. what is already said, Isa. xxiii. 18, with reference to restored Tyre, but especially Isa. lx. 9–11, and Hag. ii. 7, where Luther's beautiful translation, "*da soll dann kommen aller Heiden Trost*" (then shall the consolation of all the heathen come; A. V. "the desire of all nations"), is incorrect, the חֶמְדַּת

כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם signifying, according to the connection with ver. 8, the precious things of all the nations of the world.

(1) Jer. xlviii. 42, it was said, "Moab shall be destroyed from being a people, because he hath magnified himself against the Lord;" but then, ver. 47, "I will bring again the captivity of Moab in the latter days." [This difference in the point of view concerning Moab and Ammon in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah does not favor the theory that Deuteronomy was composed in the age of Jeremiah and in a circle akin to his.]

(2) There is here a reference to the days of David, during which Israel ruled over the neighboring nations, especially the *Edomites*. The latter afterward profited by the decline of the kingdom of Judah to regain their independence. When, then, the judgment announced by the prophet in ch. i. has been inflicted, the שְׁאֵרִית of Edom is to be incorporated into the theocracy, together with all the nations upon whom the name of Jehovah is named.

(3) Mic. iv. 1–3: "In the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and the nations shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, that He may teach us of His ways, and we may walk in His paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And He shall judge between many nations, and arbitrate for strong nations afar off. Then shall they beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

(4) Isa. lvi. 3–7: "Let not the stranger that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from His people; neither let the *eunuch* say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the *eunuchs* that keep my Sabbaths and choose the things that please me, . . . To them will I give in my house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters; I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off." It is further said by the prophet to all strangers who serve the Lord and love His name, that He will make them joyful in His house of prayer, that their burnt-offerings and sacrifices shall be accepted upon His altar, "*for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations.*"

§ 228.

The Conditions under which the Admission of the Heathen into the Kingdom of God is to take place.

The coming of this kingdom of God which embraces all nations, is, however, as is evident from the passages quoted, combined, according to prophetic intuition, with the fact *that Israel is to remain the mediatory nation at the head of the nations*, and Jerusalem with its temple to form the central point of the kingdom to which the nations are to journey. The heathen now do homage to this once despised and ill-used people. To be named after Israel is now a title of honor, Isa. xliv. 5: the heathen shall fall down and surrender themselves as vassals to Israel, "for God is in thee, and there is none other God," xlv. 14, comp. with Mic. vii. 16 sq. and other passages (1). On the other hand, the incorporation of the heathen in the kingdom of God is in Ps. lxxxvii. represented as their acquisition of rights of citizenship in Jerusalem (2), to which also the passage Isa. lvi. 3 sq. (§ 227, note 4) refers. It is, moreover, worthy of remark, that in cer-

tain passages it is predicted that after the Jews have been restored to the Holy Land, and have allied themselves with the Gentiles, the latter will assist in bringing back those members of the covenant people who are still scattered in the world, and thus become instrumental in the complete restoration of Israel. This is contained in Isa. xi. 10 sqq., xiv. 1 sq., xlix. 22, and in Zeph. iii. 10, according to the probable interpretation: "My worshippers (subject) shall bring as an offering the daughters of my dispersion (object), (my dispersed children, the members of the covenant people)" (3). A similar prediction is also found in Isa. lxvi. 18–21, a passage which indeed signifies more, but whose most probable explanation must nevertheless be, that those heathen, preserved from the judgments inflicted on the nations, now go forth as Jehovah's messengers to all nations, to bring the brethren of this people as an offering to Jehovah; though the other explanation, that these messengers will bring as an offering to God the rest of the remnant of the heathen nations as their brethren, is certainly admissible. The *rites of worship* in this future and enlarged kingdom of God are connected, in respect to sacrifice and festival, with the Old Testament ritual. It has already been shown (§ 201), that prophecy does not contemplate the abolition of sacrifice in the coming period of salvation. It will suffice here to call to mind that in the house of prayer for all nations, of Isa. lvi. 7, sacrifices are, according to the same passage, also offered; that lxvi. 23 declares that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, all flesh shall come to worship before the Lord, etc.; and that, according to Zech. xiv. 16–19, all nations must go up annually to keep the Feast of Tabernacles, which is here spoken of in its historical meaning, comp. § 156. Still there is no lack of prophetic passages in which the limitations of the Old Testament ritual are broken through. It is true, indeed, that those which have been generally claimed to support this assertion decidedly fail to do so, *e. g.* Isa. lxvi. 1–3: "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest? . . . He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood." Can this mean (says Umbreit) that there will be no temple in the new Jerusalem—that no sacrifice will be offered? How can such a fact be reconciled with lvi. 7, etc.? Nor does the passage mean (as Hitzig and Knobel understand it) that the Lord will not suffer a temple to be built to Him in Babylon, for the context shows that these words are (as Delitzsch justly regards them) addressed to the rebellious and sinful mass of the people, who even in captivity were occupied with the thought of the future temple they purposed to build at Jerusalem. From them the Lord will accept no temple, and the more so that He stands in no need of one, and that their sacrifices would only be the greatest abomination to Him. We have next, on the contrary, to notice two other most remarkable prophetic passages, of which the interpretation is more certain, and in which the connection with the place of worship in Jerusalem is effaced. The first is Mal. i. 11, a passage quoted times without number by the Fathers, and claimed by Roman Catholic theologians as the chief passage in favor of the sacrifice of the mass. "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same," says the prophet to those Jews who dishonored the Lord by their impure offerings, "my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense

is offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name is great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." According to an explanation defended by Hitzig, and even by Köhler, the passage refers to the times of the prophet, and is said to show that he regarded Ormuzd, Zeus, etc., as only different names of the one true God, of Jehovah, and therefore considered even heathen sacrifices as offered to Him. Such a view is from an Old Testament standpoint absolutely impossible (4). Every other, however, which refers this passage to the time then present is lost in a maze of subtleties. It is only in appearance that the prophet, who transposes himself to those times when the Lord will be manifested among all the heathen, speaks of the present; and what is most remarkable in his words is that they predict a sacrificial service among all nations in all parts of the world. Side by side with this may be placed the noted prophecy concerning Egypt in Isa. xix., which speaks of a worship of Jehovah instituted not by Israelites but by Egyptians (5), and indeed in the land of Egypt. This worship is, moreover, also regarded in ver. 19 as sacrificial. This prophecy, however, goes still further; for at its close, ver. 23, it makes those very nations, viz. Assyria and Egypt, which represent the hostile secular powers, as in the latter days coordinate with Israel in the kingdom of God. "In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria (6), that Assyria may come to Egypt, and Egypt to Assyria; and Egypt shall serve (*sc.* Jehovah) with Assyria. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the land, each of whom the Lord of Hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands (7), and Israel mine inheritance." Thus did the spirit of prophecy struggle to overcome particularism by exhibiting the Divine purpose concerning the kingdom of God. [It is sufficient to observe that under *the form of conception* in respect to sacrifice and temple-worship, to which the author refers, we are to understand the prophets as speaking, in accordance with the language of their time, of the spiritual worship to be offered to the true God.—D.]

(1) See also Dan. vii. 27: "The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High."

(2) Ps. lxxxvii. 3 sqq.: "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God. I will proclaim Rahab (Egypt) and Babylon as those that know me; behold, Philistia and Tyre, with Ethiopia:" of each of the above-named nations it will be said, "This man was born there" (is inscribed in the register of births there kept). "And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her" (people from all nations); "and the Highest shall establish her. The Lord shall count, when He writeth up the people, that this man was born there."

(3) [So Keil and Anger: but Hitzig, followed by Kleinert and Orelli (p. 359), "My worshippers—namely, the congregation of my dispersed ones—shall bring my offerings." The passage would then speak of a diaspora of worshippers of Jehovah belonging to the heathen world.]

(4) Besides, the honoring of God's *name* is spoken of, which always presupposes Divine revelation (§ 56).

(5) As though the prediction had been smuggled into the text of Isaiah (by Onias) in favor of the sanctuary at Leontopolis.

(6) The roads on which Old Testament times conquerors had so often marched, are now to serve for the peaceful intercourse of the nations admitted into the kingdom of God.

(7) It is worthy of remark that Assyria and Egypt here receive the same appellations which in the Old Testament express the special prerogatives of Israel.

III. THE MESSIAH (1).

§ 229.

Twofold View of the Consummation of Redemption. The Word Messiah. The Roots of the Messianic Hope in the Pentateuch.

The consummation of redemption is, according to prophetic intuition, introduced on the one hand by the *personal coming of Jehovah* in His glory, but on the other by the coming of a *King of the race of David, the Messiah* (comp. § 216. 3). The former view prevails in a great number of passages. Jehovah appears, amidst the rejoicings of all creation, to set up His kingdom upon earth, Ps. xlvi. 10 sqq., xcviii. 7 sqq. He manifests Himself to His people as when in the ancient days, He brought them forth out of Egypt, as the Redeemer, the good Shepherd, who again takes into His own hand the conduct of His scattered sheep, whom He collects and brings back, Isa. xxxv. 4 sqq., xl. 10 sq., lii. 12, Ezek. xxxiv. 11. sqq., etc. It is *Jehovah Himself* who then takes up His dwelling upon Zion, and thence rules over all nations, Zech. xiv. 16, fills the new temple with His glory, Ezek. xliii. 2, 7, nay, shines as a constant light over the whole city of God, and protects it, v. 5, as a fiery wall about it, Zech. ii. 9, etc. So substantial and appreciable will this future, compared with the former indwelling of God in His church, be, that the ark of the covenant will no longer be the vehicle of the Divine presence,—nay, it shall not even come to mind, because Jerusalem will have become the throne of God, Jer. iii. 16 sq. But while prophecy thus regards the communion into which God will in the times of redemption enter with His people as of the most direct possible kind, it on the other hand comparatively annuls this directness by another view, which runs parallel with the former. According to this view, a *distinguished instrument* of Jehovah, a *Son of David*, in whom Jehovah rules and blesses His people, is the medium by whom the consummation of redemption and the kingdom of God is brought to pass. The two views are placed in juxtaposition in Ezek. xxxiv. The Lord there declares himself against the unfaithful shepherds of His people, who have suffered them to perish. He will, it is at first said in ver. 11 sqq., *Himself* undertake the care of the sheep. But then the prophecy turns directly in ver. 23 to the other view: "I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; for he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd." Then in ver. 24 the two views are thus connected: "I the Lord will will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them" (2). Now this son of David in whom Old Testament prophecy culminates is the Messiah. The word מָשִׁיחַ, LXX χριστός is used in the Old Testament first as the designation of every one anointed with the holy anointing oil, *e.g.* in the Pentateuch of the high priest (see § 96); then, anointing being the vehicle of spiritual gifts, symbolically, *e.g.* Ps. cv. 15, where it is used, as parallel with נְבִיא, of the organs of revelation in general. But especially is "The Lord's anointed" the title of the theocratic king (§ 163); and on this account it became, chiefly by reason of the

passages Ps. ii. 2, Dan. ix. 25, the proper name of that descendant of David who was to achieve complete redemption, and bring to its consummation the kingdom of God (3).

The Messianic hope had already struck root in a series of passages in the *Pentateuch*; hence our representation of the Messianic idea must start from these. It is true that the *πρῶτον εὐαγγέλιον* of Gen. iii. 15 (§ 19, with note 3) does not speak of the seed of the woman who is to bruise the serpent's head as an individual. The passage declares that the contest with evil, to which the human race is now exposed, shall issue in the victory of the latter, though this shall not be obtained without injury (4). In the promises met with in the histories of the patriarchs, the זֶרַע of Abraham (xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18), Isaac (xxvi. 4), and Jacob (xxviii. 14), in whom all the nations of the earth are to bless themselves (comp. § 23, with note 5), is not, as many expositors insist, merely an individual. The expression refers to the entire race of Abraham as the recipients of revelation, though these promises have their final fulfilment in Christ (5). On the other hand, many modern writers (so Hengstenberg) regard Shiloh in ch. xlix. 10 as a personal proper name, viz. as the designation of the Prince of Peace who is to proceed from Judah, —"Till Shiloh come, and to Him is the obedience of the people,"—a view which, though certainly opposed by the *Parallelismus membrorum*, is still possible, and in any case preferable to that which regards שִׁילֹה as that town in the tribe of Ephraim which was in the time of the judges (§ 158) the central point of the theocracy (even Delitzsch rendering "till he come to Shiloh"). The passage is, however, probably to be explained by taking שִׁילֹה appellatively, of the rest into which Judah shall enter after victorious conflict: "until he comes to the place of rest, and the people obey him" (6). The passage is chiefly important as showing that the government of the kingdom of God is to devolve upon the tribe of Judah. The saying of Balaam, Num. xxiv. 17 sqq. (comp. § 30, with note 4), which was interpreted in a Messianic sense by Jewish antiquity (Onkelos), points to an illustrious sway proceeding from Israel, which is to subdue the neighboring states, and to outlast the fall of the nations far and near,—a sway which certainly cannot be conceived of apart from a personal ruler. Finally, with respect to the promise, Deut. xviii. 15–19 (already fully discussed, § 161, comp. § 97), which is still interpreted by many in a directly Messianic sense, נָבִיא cannot, according to the context, be confined to a single individual, the passage referring rather to the institution of the prophetic order. [See the grounds of this decision well put in the Speaker's Commentary on the passage (note), which makes it refer, taking the word "prophet" in a collective sense, to a prophetical order culminating in the Messiah as its chief.—D.] It is not, however, without importance for the development of the Messianic idea, for it teaches that for the realization of the aim of the theocracy there is needed not merely a ruler to conquer the hostile world, but also a mediator through whom Jehovah may speak, and who may declare His counsel in words. According to this principle, the kingdom of God cannot attain its consummation unless this ruler is also a prophet.

(1) See my article "Messias" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* ix. p. 408 sqq. [also Riehm, *Die messianische Weissagung*, 1875; Orelli, *Die A. T. Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreich*, 1882; Hitzig, *Biblische Theologie u. messianische Weissa-*

gungen des A. T. 1880; Delitzsch, *Messianic Prophecy*, transl. by Prof. Curtiss, 1880, and among English authors, the well-known work of J. Pye Smith, *Scripture Testimony of the Messiah;* R. Payne Smith, *Prophecy a Preparation for Christianity* (Bampton Lecture), 1869; Gloag, *Messianic Prophecy*, 1879, etc.—D.]

(2) That prophecy, moreover, views the relation of this second David to Jehovah as an internal one, will be shown below (§ 231).

(3) On the use of the word in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and in the New Testament, see the article cited, p. 409, 2d ed. p. 641.

(4) On Gen. iv. 1, see § 69. 2, with note 5; on v. 29, § 20, with note 6.

(5) Hence the passages quoted are, in their more extended signification, Messianic.

(6) [Orelli accepts the view adopted by many, that the word should be read שִׁלּוֹ = אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, which gives the rendering "until he come to whom it (the sceptre) belongs;" but this is strained.—D.] It is quite incorrect to refer עַמִּים to the tribes of Israel.

§ 230 (1).

The Promise, 2 *Sam.* vii., *as the Foundation of the Messianic Idea in its stricter sense. The Messianic Psalms.*

The choice of the house of David, already spoken of in another connection (comp. 2 Sam. vii. 1 Chron. xvii.), forms the foundation of the Messianic idea in its stricter sense. David desires to build a house for the Lord, who forbids the undertaking, but promises, on the other hand, that He will build David a house, by establishing his seed in the kingdom for ever. To this seed of David God will be a father, and this seed shall be the Son of God. God will punish the sins of David's seed in measure, but not with extirpation; on the contrary, He will never wholly take His favor from him. *The Seed of David* to whom this promise applies is not the whole of David's descendants: He is indeed to be of *David's sons*, as 1 Chron. xvii. 11 adds by way of explanation, but He is not limited to a single individual. According to the exposition which the Old Testament itself gives of this promise, the seed means the descendants of David so far as by Divine favor they are elected to the succession to the throne; and the passage does not speak of the eternal sway of one king, but of the continual kingship of the house of David, David himself designating the word as spoken concerning his *house* for ever, 2 Sam. vii. 25. The fulfilment of the promise began, according to 1 Chron. xxii. 9 sq., 1 Kings v. 19, with Solomon, but is referred by the psalms which comment upon it, Ps. lxxxix. 30 sqq., and also cxxxii. 11 sq., to all the descendants of David who succeed to the throne. 2 Sam. vii., however, forms in a twofold respect the starting-point for the more definite form of the Messianic idea,—*first*, by the fact that that consummation of the kingdom of God for which Israel was chosen, is from this time forward connected with a *King* who, as the Son of God, *i.e.* the representative of Jehovah, and, fitted by Him to be the depositary of the Divine sovereignty on earth, stands in a relation of most intimate connection with God; and, *secondly*, in that it is established for all time that this King is to be a *Son of David*. (That "for ever" must be taken in its strict sense, is shown by Ps. lxxxix. 37 sq.) The seed of David may be humbled, but not for ever, 1 Kings xi. 39 (2). The crown of David may be taken away, but One will come whose right it is, Ezek. xxi. 27 sq. The *topmost* branch of the cedar, which in Ezekiel's vision, ch. xvii.,

represents the house of David, may be broken off (3), but the cedar itself remains. How glorious the view of the Davidic kingdom is rendered by the promise, 2 Sam. vii., is first shown by the last song of David, 2 Sam. xxiii. Its delineation of a righteous ruler, under whom a happy future is to flourish, and its statement that such a government signifies the eternal covenant made by God with the house of David, plainly shows that the perception of the *idea* of the kingship is here already advancing toward its individualization in an *ideal*, and thus arises *image prophecy*, as Sack aptly calls it. Qualities which apply not to himself personally, but to the *kingship* which he represents, may indeed be attributed to every king who sits on David's throne ; and this is the principle by which such passages as Ps. xxi. 5, 7, lxi. 7, are to be explained. But sacred poetry, under the impulse of the Spirit, now creates a kingly image, in which all that the present manifests is far surpassed, and the kingship of David and Solomon beheld in typical perfection. This leads us to the *Messianic psalms*, ii., xlv., lxxii., cx., with respect to which *three different views* have at all times existed. According to *the first* (which is in part found in Calvin), these psalms are to be referred to some actual Israelite king ; but since they *idealize* his government, and thus transfer to him predicates, such as the right to universal sovereignty, Ps. ii. 2, and the union of an everlasting priesthood with his kingship, Ps. cx., which cannot find in him their full historical accomplishment, they *typically* point to the future realizer of the theocratic kingship. According to *the second* view (Hengstenberg, Umbreit), the poet, filled with the idea of the theocratic kingship, really rises in these psalms to the view of an individual in whom this *idea is perfectly realized*, and hence, according to the mind of the Spirit, is speaking of the coming Messiah. According to *the third* view (4), we must in these psalms distinguish between their original signification, by which they refer to an historical king, and the *use* which, as prophetic and Messianic songs of praise, they *subsequently* acquired in Divine worship. This third view is especially applicable to Ps. xlv., which was originally composed on the occasion of the marriage of an Israelite king, perhaps Solomon, with the daughter of the Egyptian king, but which certainly *acquired*, by *allegorical interpretation*, a Messianic signification in its liturgical use by the church and in the older Jewish theology (5), so far as we can trace it back. The second view—the directly Messianic interpretation—is, on the other hand, fully borne out, even apart from any subsequent use of these songs, in the three remaining psalms,—in Ps. ii., which describes the victorious Prince as receiving, in virtue of His Divine Sonship, the whole earth as His inheritance (6) ; in Ps. lxxii., which prays for the coming of the great Prince of Peace, who shall reign with righteousness for ever, shall especially defend the poor and afflicted, and to whom, therefore, all the nations and kings of the earth shall do homage, and in whom, ver. 17, the words spoken of Abraham's seed, Gen. xxii. 18, etc., shall find their fulfilment ; and in Ps. cx., which celebrates the King who subdues the hostile world as being at the same time the possessor of an everlasting priesthood (7). The so-called historical interpretation would here divest some passages of their meaning, and have to be supported by hyperbole, etc.

(1) [On the connection between the idea of the Messianic Kingdom and that of the theocratic kingdom, comp. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 120 (Eng. tr.). The prophecy of the Messianic king appears in that work as the unfolding of the idea

of the theocratic king, the perfect realization of which the future must bring. The institution of the theocratic kingdom is thus presented as a real prophecy, and the Messianic predictions of the prophet as the interpretation of this real prophecy. But in the endeavor to seize Messianic prophecy in its historical relations, Riehm does not appear to do entire justice to what he himself claims for the prophets, viz. the "*special* agency of the Spirit of God in revelation." His statements often make the impression that no use is made in prophecy of this *special* agency.]

(2) The continued right of the race of David to the throne is never called in question by prophecy, though it often passes sentence of rejection upon individual kings of Judah.

(3) Ezek. xvii.: An eagle comes and breaks off the topmost branch of the cedar and brings it into a land of traffic, a city of merchants; *i.e.*, according to the prophet's own explanation, Nebuchadnezzar comes and carries away King Jehoiachin with the rest of the royal family to Babylon. The eagle, on the other hand, plants a twig of vine in the land, signifying the appointment of Zedekiah by Nebuchadnezzar. But this plant is also rooted up.

(4) So H. Schultz on the double meaning of Scripture, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1866, and *Alttest. Theol.* p. 828.

(5) In Ps. xlv. the Messianic view is generally combined with the allegorical interpretation. [Vaihinger is an exception.] It is only by doing some violence to the language that the allegorical meaning can be regarded as originally intended by the author, especially if the psalm is held to be an allegorical representation of the union of the Messiah with Israel (the יְדִיד *consort*), whom the heathen nations (the virgins, the companions of the queen) follow. How entirely, to bring forward only one point, is the thought found in ver. 11, that Israel, to unite with the Messiah, must forget its people and father's house, opposed to all the teachings of the Old Testament! When the Targum explains the passage by Josh. xxiv. 14,—when Hengstenberg refers to Gen. xii. 1, and v. Gerlach dilutes the thought to, Israel must make no kind of claim on the ground of its previous relations,—these are the mere expedients of perplexity, and do justice neither to the words nor the context. The bride is evidently the daughter of a *heathen* king; and hence, if the psalm is allegorically interpreted, the explanation of H. A. Hahn (*Das Hohelied von Salomo übersetzt und erklärt*, p. 5), which makes it merely describe the *introduction of the heathen world into the kingdom of God*, is a more obvious one.

(6) When the attempt is made to set aside this view by the remark that it is inconceivable that the author should intend to sing the praise of a king who is only expected, there is a strange disregard of the fact that in Ps. lxxxvii., *e.g.*, the future glories of the city of God, and in Ps. xcvi.–xcviii., of the future coming of Jehovah to establish His kingdom, are thus extolled in song. Why should not the minstrel be equally able to behold and treat as present the future rule of the Messiah? Would it not have been strange indeed if the Messianic hopes of Israel had found no expression in the sacred poetry of the Old Testament?

(7) In Ps. cx., the feature that an everlasting priesthood is awarded to this King, ver. 4, is of special significance. The theocratic kingship had indeed already attained in David a certain priestly character (see § 165, with note 8); but such a union of the priesthood with the kingship as existed in the person of Melchizedek is, from the standpoint of the theocratic institutions, impossible. The expression "after the manner of Melchizedek" leads beyond these; and it is because this union of priesthood and kingship was a thing so utterly unheard of, so entirely new, that a Divine oath was needed to introduce its announcement. The union here predicted of the priestly and kingly offices in the Messiah will be more particularly considered, § 234.

§ 231.

The Development of the Idea of the Messiah in the Prophets: the older Prophetic Writings; the Prophetic Doctrine concerning the Nature of the Messiah.

If we now turn to the *prophetical books*, we shall find in the *older writings* none of the more special references to the person of the Messiah. In the description of the times of redemption in Amos ix. 11 (§ 227), the restoration of the fallen kingship of David is only spoken of in a general manner. In Hos. iii. 5, comp. with ii. 2, there is a more distinct mention of the reunion of all Israel, at their restoration, under one head of the family of David. But full and detailed predictions of the Messiah are not met with till after the middle of the eighth century, in *Isaiah* and *Micah*, whose aim it was to explain, in the light of the Divine counsels, the approaching catastrophes in which Israel would be involved by its complication with the secular powers, and to show that the final aim of the ways of God was being prepared for by the impending judgments. Such Messianic prophecy is, however, by no means introduced by them as something absolutely new and till now alien to the prophetic consciousness (1). The low estate to which the Davidic kingdom had fallen was indeed the external occasion of directing the prophetic glance the more vividly toward its perfection, because it is at those times when the Divine promise seems, humanly speaking, to fail, that it is the office of prophecy to testify to its certain performance; but it is by no means true that the contemplation of the contrast produced the image of the Messiah. To sum up, then, the essential features of Messianic prophecy, let us inquire, *first*, What does prophecy teach concerning the *nature* of the Messiah? does it attribute to Him a superhuman dignity? The meaning of almost all the passages on this subject has been made a matter of controversy. We begin with Mic. v. 2 sqq. According to ver. 2, the Messiah is indeed to proceed from Bethlehem, the small and insignificant town of David; but "His goings forth" (מוֹצָאֹתָיו) are "from of old, from the days of eternity." If the latter words, expressing as they do a contrast with the origin from Bethlehem, refer, as many modern writers assert, merely to the descent of the Messiah from the ancient house of David, the contrast they present is a very faint one, in which, moreover, justice is not done to the evident reference of מוֹצָאֹתָיו to לִי יֵצֵא in the preceding clause (see especially Umbreit on the passage). The words speak either of an eternal and Divine origin of the Messiah (2), or state—in which case certainly there is more reason for the use of the plural מוֹצָאוֹת—that the entire sacred history from its very beginnings (*origines*) contains the going forths of the Messiah, the preparatory elements of His coming (3). In ver. 3, Micah says mysteriously of the birth of the Messiah, "Therefore will He give them up" (Israel to judgment) "until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth." To understand (with Calvin and many modern writers, even Kleinert) יוֹלֵדָה, by referring back to iv. 9 sq., of the daughter of Zion, is forbidden by the absence of the article. The passage speaks of the mother of the Messiah; and the prophet, as Hitzig correctly remarks, "expresses himself with becoming reserve concerning obscure and mysterious subjects." It is noticeable indeed that the prophets, however near

at hand their intuition may make the advent of the Messiah, never speak of Him as the son of any actually existing king (4). Isa. iv. 2 (if the Messiah is there spoken of, as the Targumists supposed) corresponds with Mic. v. 2, the coming One being then designated the צֶמַח יְהוָה by His Divine, and the פְּרִי הָאָרֶץ by His earthly and national descent. This interpretation is, however, by no means certain. The passage Mic. v. 3, on the other hand, is parallel with the prophecy Isa. vii. 14 of the birth of Immanuel from the עַלְמָה, a passage whose reference to the Messiah is demanded by its connection with ix. 5 (5), though the interpretation at present prevailing regards it as only typically Messianic (see even Bengel's Gnomon). עַלְמָה, indeed, is not = בְּתוּלָה, as if the birth of Messiah from the *virgo illibata* were here taught. Besides, the essential feature of the given sign is not the fact that a עַלְמָה conceives, but that the *Messiah is Immanuel*, that the unchangeable communion of God with His people is actually made apparent in the midst of impending judgments. The mysterious nature, however, of the expression can neither here nor in Micah be mistaken (6). The exalted nature of the Messiah is more definitely brought forward in ix. 6 sq. : "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given ; and the government is upon His shoulders ; and His name is called the Wonderful-Counsellor (comp. xxviii. 29 and Judg. xiii. 18, marg. A. V.), the mighty God" (for so must it be understood, comp. x. 21), "the everlasting Father [so Orelli and Böhl], the Prince of Peace ; for the increase of the government and for peace without end, on David's throne and in his kingdom, to establish and support it with judgment and justice, from henceforth and for ever." The *Messiah is evidently regarded as a Divine Being*, though here also the expressions are mysteriously indefinite. In the Messianic passage xi. 1 sqq., the Divine element in the Messiah appears only as the fulness of the Spirit of the Lord resting upon Him, and endowing Him for His righteous and happy rule. How close, side by side, to use Stier's expression, the two lines of promise—the appearance of God and the appearance of the Messiah—run, and seem almost to touch without uniting, is shown also by the Messianic predictions of the subsequent prophets. And first, we must notice Jer. xxiii. in connection with xxxiii. 14-26 and Ezek. xxxiv. In the first passage, the prophet, who in ch. xxii. had declared the race of the two kings Jehoiachin and Jehoiakim to be excluded from the throne of David, proclaims that the Lord will, at the time when He gathers His flock from all countries whither He has driven them, raise up unto David a righteous Branch (צֶמַח). The same expression reappears xxxiii. 15 ; nay, "Branch" becomes even a *proper name of the Messiah*, Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12. (From these passages, it is very evident that when in Jer. xxx. 9, Ezek. xxxiv. 23 sq., xxxviii. 24, it is said with reference to the future ruler, that David is to be raised up, we are not, like Ammon (7) and others, to imagine a resurrection of the former king David.) When, now, it is said, Jer. xxiii. 6, of the Messiah, that the name wherewith He shall be called is "the Lord our righteousness" (יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ), the older theology was certainly mistaken in regarding this as a proof text of the first order for the divinity of the Messiah ; for it is not said that the Messiah is Jehovah our righteousness, but that He is called Jehovah our righteousness, because in Him and through Him Jehovah is perceived to constitute His people's righteousness. In the parallel passage, xxxiii. 16, moreover, it is said that in those days *Jerusalem* shall be called Jehovah our righteousness, and

in Ex. xvii. 15 an altar is called "Jehovah my banner." When, however, the Messiah is designated, Jer. xxx. 21, as the Governor that shall proceed from the midst of the people, whom God will cause to draw near to Him that He may approach unto Him,—"for who is this that engages His heart to approach unto me?"—a specific relation of the Messiah to Jehovah such as no human being could claim for himself is here alluded to by Jeremiah. With this corresponds the גֶּבֶר עֲמִיתִי, "the man that is my fellow," of Zech. xiii. 7, according to the Messianic and only tenable interpretation of this passage. Special stress has been laid upon xii. 8. It is there declared how the Lord will, in the last conflict that shall rage against the Holy City, defend and strengthen the citizens, so that in that day "he that stumbles among them shall be as David, and the house of David as God, as the angel of the Lord before them." Here, it has been said, the house of David is comprised in its head, the Messiah, who is here designated as the angel in whom Jehovah, in the days of old, marched at the head of His people. But does such a view of "the house of David" agree with the connection with ver. 7, and especially with ver. 10 sqq.? If lamentation for the pierced Messiah (of which we shall speak § 234) is really the subject of ver. 10, must not the house of David in ver. 8 be taken in the same sense as the מִשְׁפַּחַת בֵּית־דָּוִיד of ver. 12, *i.e.* exclusive of the Messiah? (8). But then we ask, If the house of David is in those days endowed with such victorious power as to be compared even to the angel of the Lord, what will the second David Himself be? The second passage on this topic, Mal. iii. 1, is also a subject of controversy: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, and the angel (messenger) of the covenant whom ye desire, behold, He shall come;" ver. 2: "But who may abide the day of His coming, and who shall stand when He appeareth?" It is evident from iv. 5 sq. (9) who the *preceding* messenger is; a prophet zealous for the law is, in the power of Elijah, to call the people to repentance, that the day of the Lord's appearing may not be for their destruction. But the Lord who sends this harbinger before Him, and then Himself comes to His temple, is Jehovah (10), the God of judgment,—longed for, according to ii. 17, by the people, as appears also by comparing iii. 5. But who then is the מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית, "the angel of the covenant," whose coming coincides with the coming of Jehovah? Certainly *not* the forerunner spoken of at the beginning of the verse. We naturally think of that angel of the Divine presence by whom Jehovah once led His people in the wilderness, and who was now again to be the medium of His covenant relation to Israel (11); but in this case this passage says nothing of the coming of the Messiah, although it is in fact quite correct to say with Hengstenberg, "that this announcement received its final fulfilment in the appearance of Christ, in whom the angel of the Lord, the λόγος, became flesh." We may, however, with Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 183), refer the מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית as well as the first מַלְאָךְ to a human instrument for the establishment of the covenant, the counterpart of Moses, the *Mediator* of the new and more perfect relation and communion between God and His people, and therefore to the Messiah Himself. Then the passage certainly makes the coming of Jehovah and the coming of the Messiah the same, though without stating anything concerning the internal relation of the two to each other. Finally, we turn to the teaching of the Book of Daniel. In the chief

passage, vii. 13 sq. (12), the interpretation of which is also controverted, Daniel sees in a vision one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven, brought before the Ancient of Days, and endowed by Him with eternal dominion over all nations. The view (Hofmann and Köhler) (13), that the human form here spoken of signifies not an individual, the Messiah, but the Messianic kingdom, the possessors of which are the saints of the Most High, vers. 18, 22, 27 (§ 227, note 1),—that this kingdom is, in contrast to those secular kingdoms denoted by symbolical forms of animals coming from beneath, a heavenly and a genuinely human one,—cannot be decidedly refuted. As far, however, as traditional exegesis can be followed back (14), the son of man has been regarded as the Messiah, who hence appears, as Paul says, as the Lord from heaven (15). Besides, the secular powers also appear incorporated in *individual* rulers (as the Chaldean in Nebuchadnezzar, ii. 38). It has been already remarked (§ 199) (16), that if the Messianic interpretation of the passage is adopted, the combination of the son of man with the mysterious being in viii. 15–17, x. 5 sqq., xii. 6 sqq., is an obvious step (17).

(1) The view which makes the Messianic hope in general originate in the 8th century B.C. cannot be sustained.

(2) So Caspari [and Böhl]. Micah, however, makes no further disclosure in this respect.

(3) So Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. p. 9 sq.): "The ruler has been going forth from inconceivable distant ages, and His advent is approaching; and this advent is at length to proceed from Bethlehem. For since He is the person to whom the history of mankind, of Israel, and of the house of David tends, all the progress of any of these are but germs of His advent, goings forth of the second son of Jesse, of the second David." [Orelli adopts this interpretation, p. 345 sqq.]

(4) According to Mic. v. 4, the Messiah shall then "stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, and in the majesty of the name of the Lord His God;" hence He is to be endowed with Divine power, that He may conduct His government with Divine authority, and be the revealer of Jehovah. The expression recalls the former angel of the covenant, Ex. xxiii. 21.

(5) Ewald especially [also Orelli and Böhl] has again defended the Messianic interpretation of Isa. vii. 14.

(6) I cannot here enter into all the other difficulties.

(7) See Ammon, *Die Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion*, i. p. 178; also Hitzig. Compare the expectation of King Sebastian by the Portuguese, and of Barbarossa by the Germans.

(8) So Schmieder, whose further exposition of the passage may be omitted.

(9) Mal. iv. 5: "Behold, I will send unto you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord."

(10) Not the Messiah; as Jahn, *Appendix herm.* p. 58, holds.

(11) So *e.g.* Hävernick, *Theol. des A. T.* 2d ed. p. 212 [and Orelli, p. 509.]

(12) Dan. vii. 13 sq. forms the conclusion of the prophetic vision, in which the four universal empires are represented under the image of four beasts (§ 221). After the dominion is taken from these beasts, the kingdom of God is set up. "I saw in the night vision, and behold one like a son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before Him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

(13) [Similarly Hitzig, *Mess. Weiss.* p. 120, "the personified people of the saints of the Most High." Against this view, Anger, p. 81; Orelli, p. 519 sq., and especially Riehm, p. 123 sqq.]

(14) The oldest witnesses of this are the *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* of the New Testament and the Book of Enoch.

(15) At the same time he appears as man. As C. B. Michaelis justly remarks, there is no more a Docetic element in כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ than in *ὅμοιος υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου*, Rev. i. 13 : כְּ *non excludit rei veritatem, sed formam ejus, quod visum est, describit.* (Hengstenberg thinks otherwise, and considers the expression to point to the fact that there is in the Messiah another aspect in which He is far more than human.)

(16) According to the usual view, the Messiah does not again appear among the celestial beings of the Book of Daniel. [Riehm is decidedly opposed to the above combination.]

(17) The identification of this *κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* in human form, who even during the time of the secular empires advances the counsel of God in the heathen world, and at last receives universal dominion, with the son of David of the other prophets, is not indeed completed in the Book of Daniel. Such a circumstance is, however, characteristic of prophecy ; see § 216. 3. For while we find in the Old Testament the postulates of all the essential definitions of New Testament Christology, the revelation which organically combines and completes them is not given till the facts of revelation are consummated.

§ 232.

Continuation : The Office and Work of the Messiah.

With respect, *secondly*, to the *office* and *work* of the Messiah, these are, as the name itself implies, first those of a *king*. His coming presupposes the rejection of the nation, and the deepest humiliation of the house of David ; hence the Messianic kingdom rises *from an abject to a glorious state*. This thought is expressed in Mic. v. 2, but especially in Isa. xi. 1. The Messiah comes forth as a rod or sprout out of the גֵּזַע (the trunk of a hewn-down tree, as in Job xiv. 8) of Jesse. The royal race is named after Jesse, because the appearance of the Messiah, the second David, corresponds with the elevation of the first David from his low estate, on which account also the Messiah, like the first David, proceeds from the insignificant town of Bethlehem. The passage Ezek. xvii. 22 sqq., already cited § 230, also treats of this subject. From the lofty cedar of Lebanon, which here represents the royal house of David, the Lord takes a tender twig and plants it on Mount Zion ; this twig grows into a goodly cedar, under whose shadow all the birds of the air (the different nations of the earth) assemble, and which is exalted above all the trees of the field (the earthly powers). This must certainly not be referred to Zerubbabel, but to the Messianic kingship, which was to be raised from small and insignificant beginnings to glory. With this corresponds the description Zech. ix. 9 sq. It is not with the pomp of an earthly conqueror, but with lowly array and riding upon an ass, that the Messiah makes His entry into Jerusalem. His kingdom has no need of warlike weapons, which are, on the contrary, to be swept away (comp. Isa. ix. 4). Beginning at Jerusalem, He founds a peaceful kingdom, which is to reach from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth (1). When, then, the Messianic government is here, as also in Mic. v. 6 sqq., and afterward in Zech. ix. 11 sqq., again represented as a warlike one, the remarks already made (§ 216. 3) on such unconnected juxtaposition of dissimilar features must be applied.

The question, however, which even in the ancient church was one of the most important subjects of dispute, especially in meeting the objections of the Jews,

viz. Does the Old Testament also speak of a *suffering* Christ? (Χριστὸς παθητός), *i.e.* one who atones by death and suffering for the sins of the people, now claims a more particular discussion. The Messianic passages hitherto quoted do not involve this. The incipient abasement of the Messiah, considered in and by itself, stands in no relation to the abolition of sin. According to Isa. xi. 4, 9, the Messiah effects the latter, first, by judging righteously, by smiting the land with the rod of His mouth, and slaying the wicked with the breath of His lips; and, secondly, by the fact that under Him the earth shall be full of the *knowledge* of the Lord, so that none shall hurt or destroy upon His holy mountain. But, *together* with these statements, there is another prophetic view which points to a *servant of God* who *suffers in the place of the people*, to an act of atonement on which the dawning of the day of redemption depends, to the *priesthood of the Messiah.* To make evident, however, the connection between this branch of prophecy and the whole doctrinal system of the Old Testament, it will be necessary to enter somewhat more into detail.

(1) See further on the progress of the Messianic kingdom, § 228. On the entire passage Zech. ix. 9 sqq. comp. Orelli, p. 275 sqq.

§ 233.

Continuation.

The answer given by the Old Testament to the question, *Of what importance are the sufferings of the righteous with respect to the kingdom of God?* is, in the first place, that inasmuch as the sufferings of a righteous man give occasion to the manifestation of God's faithfulness and power in his deliverance, they serve not only as a pattern and pledge of the grace of God to strengthen and comfort other just men, but also to procure an acknowledgment of His saving power from those who as yet have not known Him. This thought is most completely carried out in the 22d Psalm. A guiltless sufferer, exposed to ruthless enemies and undergoing agonizing torture, prays for deliverance from his misery. While he is wrestling in prayer, faith triumphs; nay, in the latter part of the psalm, prayer is exchanged for the glad announcement that it has been heard. Then follows a description how, in consequence of this Divine act of deliverance, all who are afflicted and exposed to death find refreshment at the sacrificial feast made by the rescued sufferer; nay, the ends of the earth, all the heathen nations, turn to the Lord. This description at the end of the psalm recalls especially the predicted feast of the Messianic days, Isa. xxv. 6 sqq., which God is preparing upon Mount Zion for all nations, and at which the mourning veil shall be taken from all nations, and death forever destroyed (§ 226) (1). Whether the psalm was occasioned by the experience of a David (although a corresponding event in his life cannot be pointed out, since even 1 Sam. xxiii. 25 sqq., does not entirely answer), a Jeremiah, or some other servant of God (2), the description given of the causal connection between the sufferings of a righteous person and the consummation of the kingdom of God far surpasses anything that could be predicated of any Old Testament character. Neither can Israel as a nation (Kimchi), well as many of the expressions apply, be the subject of the psalm; for the speaker very decidedly distinguishes himself

from the people, ver. 23 sq. The fact is (comp. Hengstenberg's later explanation of the psalm), that we have here portrayed an ideal individual, in whom the sufferings of the servant of God and their happy results are complete. It cannot indeed be proved that the Messiah, the Son of David, is in the Psalmist's intention the subject of the psalm, though the thought that the path from suffering to glory which David had to tread would be repeated in the case also of his great descendant, could not be very distant.

A far more profound view is, however, taken of the sufferings of a just man, when the light in which they are regarded is that of *substitutionary atonement*. That the intercession of the righteous for a sinful nation is effectual, is a thought running through the entire Old Testament from Gen. xviii. 23 sqq. and Ex. xxxii. 32 sqq. (comp. Ps. cvi. 23, and subsequently Amos vii. 1 sqq.) onward. This subject has already been repeatedly brought forward (see § 29, with note 3, § 127). It is indeed also stated that guilt may reach a height at which God will no longer accept the intercession of His servants, Jer. xv. 1 sq. (3). There is a limit to the prophet's duty of standing in the breach, as it is expressed Ezek. xiii. 5 and elsewhere. Jeremiah is commanded to intercede no more for the people, now ripe for judgment. And indeed even the righteousness of the servants of God is insufficient in His sight to constitute them valid intercessors for the sinful people. Their appointed mediators (מְלִיצִים) are themselves sinful, and therefore incapable of averting the decree of judgment from the nation; see as chief passage, Isa. xliii. 27. They must be contented if they deliver themselves by their righteousness, Ezek. xiv. 14 sqq. But for this very reason the prophecy of redemption is not complete till it beholds an individual who is capable of effectually advocating the cause of the people before God; and this is the *servant of Jehovah*, Isa. liii. That the prophetic intuition of the עֶבֶד יְהוָה in the Book of Isaiah, xl.–lxvi., commences with the *nation*, but culminates in an individual, has been already remarked in § 227. So early as ch. xlii. and xlix. the view is gradually transferred from the nation to an individual distinct from the nation, who (xlii. 6) negotiates a covenant for the people, and then becomes the light of the Gentiles,—who, as mediator of the covenant, resettles the people like a second Joshua in the possession of the land, xlix. 8 (4). Even if in these passages the servant, so far as he is distinguished from the people, is made to refer to that *germ* which represents the genuine Israel, the aggregate of the servants of God, including the true prophets (5), yet ch. liii., on the contrary, can only refer to an *individual*. (Hence Ewald, *e.g.*, regards this portion as interpolated from an older book, in which a single martyr was spoken of (6). For it is not the heathen who speak, as the utterly erroneous view now so widely disseminated asserts, but the prophet, now in the name of the prophets in general, ver. 1: "Who hath believed our report?" and now in that of the people, ver. 6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of *us* all." The sense of guilt is so vivid, even in the case of the prophets who know themselves to be the servants of God, that they include themselves in the sinful mass of the people for whom an atonement is needed: "*We* are *all* as the unclean" (comp. lix. 12). Hence a valid intercession for the people cannot proceed from them, lix. 16; nor can even the aggregate of God's servants effect an atonement. On the contrary, it is upon the foundation of its intuition of those witnesses who have

suffered in the cause of truth, that prophecy rises to the intuition of *one* in whom the image of the faithful servant is complete,—of one who, not for his own sins, but as the substitute of the people and for their sins, lays down his life as an אָשָׁם (liii. 10, comp. § 137), a payment in full for debt, but is, notwithstanding the prophetic message (שָׁמַעְתֶּנוּ, ver. 1) which points to him, despised and regarded by his people, for whom he appears, as stricken of God for his own transgressions (7); nay, who is, moreover, treated even in death like the violent wicked and the deceitful rich (עָשִׁיר in ver. 9, 1*b*, being elucidated by the contrast in 2*b*), and like those whom a curse follows even to the grave. God leads him from the grave to glory, so that he is now the author of righteousness to many, and divides the spoil with the strong. The supposed traces of a collective meaning in לָמוֹ, ver. 8, and בְּמֹתָיו, ver. 9, disappear when they are correctly interpreted (8). Thus it was during the period when Israel was without a place of sacrifice in which to seek for an atonement by the blood of beasts, that it was disclosed to the prophetic spirit that the voluntary self-sacrifice of one perfectly righteous would be an atoning sacrifice for the redemption of the people.

(1) This sacrificial feast, Ps. xxii. 27, at which those exposed to death eat of such things that their hearts live for ever, reaches far beyond what an Israelite at his thank-offering was accustomed, according to Deut. xvi. 11, to prepare for the poor and needy.

(2) [That Ps. xxii. takes for its point of departure the sufferings of a man of God, is held also by the more recent commentators who do not deny its prophetic import, as Orelli, p. 196 sqq., and Böhl, p. 152 sq.]

(3) Jer. xv. 1: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people: cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth."

(4) In Isa. xlii. 1, the servant upon whom the *Spirit* of the Lord rests, that he may bring forth the claims of the Lord before the Gentiles, forms, in the first place, a contrast to heathendom and its *windy* ways, xli. 29. As the discourse proceeds, however, he is, ver. 7, placed beside Cyrus, which speaks for the concentration of the עֶבֶד in an individual. Comp. Delitzsch in Drechsler's Commentary on Isa. vol. iii. p. 336 sq.: "The idea of עֶבֶד יְהוָה is, to represent it in brief and to the senses, a pyramid; its lowest base is collective Israel, its middle part Israel not *κατὰ σάρκα* but *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, its apex the person of the Redeemer. It is one and the same idea which, when concentrated, becomes personal, and when extended is again national." What has been said above may show how far I now think it necessary to modify what I formerly said in my article on the Servant of Jehovah, Isa. xl. sqq. (*Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1840, No. 2, p. 134 sqq.).

(5) That the true prophets are included among these servants of God, is self-evident; nay, Isa. xlviii. 16, l. 4 sqq., may be so far referred to the prophet himself. It would be from his own experience of sorrow that he here depicted the servant of the Lord. But it is utterly incorrect to suppose that the prophetic order is directly intended by this image. For how could it be the office of the prophetic order to distribute to the restored people their desolated inheritance, etc., not to mention that the prophets formed no corporate body, nay, that in lvi. 10 the mass of the צֹפִים are designated as blind and ignorant, and as dumb dogs?

(6) [The passage is referred to a future individual by Böhl and Orelli; even H. Schultz (p. 753) cannot rid himself of the impression that the assumption of a mere collective does not do justice to the passage, although his view is so far vacillating that he again conceives the "ideal image of the end of pious Israel regarded as a person," to be what the prophet indicates. His view therefore is

scarcely different from that of Riehm (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 189), that in the ideal person of the Servant of God the Church of God in the Old Testament is represented. Hitzig's view, that the passage refers to the people of Israel as being, in contrast with the heathen, relatively righteous, and appointed to atone for the much greater sins of the latter, must be pronounced impossible. Anger and Duhm would still refer it to the better part of the nation, or ideal Israel, and make the sufferings refer to the Babylonian captivity.]

(7) Isa. liii. 4 sq.: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, yet did we esteem him stricken of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."

(8) [That לָמוֹ occurs in the singular for לוֹ is unquestionable (comp. xliv. 15). But I think that מִפֶּשַׁע עַמִּי in Isa. liii. 8 must be connected with what precedes, thus: "that he is cut off out of the land of the living for the transgression of my people," and the next words לָמוֹ נֶגַע must then be explained "a blow (= one stricken) for them," or since the מִן in מִפֶּשַׁע also extends to נֶגַע "on account of the blow for them" (= on account of the punishment due to them).—For the plural בָּמוֹתָיו v. 9, comp. Ezek. xxviii. 8, where the King of Tyre is addressed: "thou diest the death of him that is slain." The same plural occurs in Ezek. xxviii. 10. It is the plural of the generic idea, מוֹתִים meaning "kinds of death." Others (even Orelli) read בְּמוֹתָיו in v. 9 as having the meaning of בָּמוֹת (heights) thus: "they appointed for him with the rich one his grave-mound," but Ezek. xliii. 7 can be appealed to in support of this only by an incorrect explanation].

§ 234.

Continuation.

What has been said, however, still leaves it an open question whether the prophet *was himself conscious that this servant of God, who atones by his sufferings for the sins of the people, is indeed the Messiah, i.e.* the great Son of David. A decided answer to this question cannot be given either in the affirmative or negative (1). In the Book Isaiah, xl. sqq., there is but one passage (lv. 3 sqq.) in which the promise to David is returned to. The statement there made, that David is appointed to be a witness and a commander of the people, may be combined with liii. 12, according to which the servant, after having completed his work of atonement, divides the spoil with the strong (2). But the connection of the two views is certainly not fully effected. On the other side, however, it is not true that the prophet divides (as Ewald says) the secular and spiritual sides of the notion of the Messiah between Cyrus and the servant of the Lord. For though Cyrus appears indeed as a Divine instrument for the deliverance of Israel, and gives glory, as a heathen, to the name of Jehovah, he is not brought forward as one who is to carry on unto perfection the kingdom of God upon earth. In *Zechariah*, on the contrary, the Messiah distinctly appears as the future Redeemer of the people, and indeed as their atoning High Priest. This is the case first in ch. iii. (comp. § 200), where the people are comforted by the statement that God will graciously accept the priesthood over which he presides, while in ver. 8 sq. it is further declared that the true time of grace is still future; he through whom the complete absolution of the people (and that on one day) is to be effected must first appear. This future atoner to whom the present priesthood typ-

ically refers, is *the Branch*, the Son of David, the Messiah (comp. § 231). Hence allusion is now made, vi. 9–15, by the symbolical action of crowning the high priest Joshua with the double crown, to the union of the priestly and royal dignities in the person of the Messiah. For in this so often incorrectly understood passage the Branch can alone be the subject of וְהָיָה, ver. 13, and two persons are not there spoken of.

The Messiah here appears as an atoning Priest; but another special feature is added, xii. 10–13. The prophet declares that the future restoration of the communion of the covenant people with the Lord will be effected on His part by the outpouring of the spirit of grace and supplication, and on that of the people by contrition and repentance: "I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo." Thus much is clear in this much-misused passage, that the piercing of one, in whose person the Lord is as it were Himself pierced, is spoken of. The assassination of a prophet, as Hitzig and H. Schultz suppose, is very far from being intended. The pierced one must be one who may be likened to king Josiah, with whom, when he was mortally wounded in the valley of Megiddo, the last hope of the nation fell (§ 184). And who else can this be than that Shepherd and fellow of Jehovah, who, according to xiii. 7, fell by the sword, after the last effort of deliverance which God made through him had proved vain, nay, had been shamefully requited, xi. 4–14. Justice was so far done to the Messianic interpretation by the older Jewish theology, that since the acknowledgment of a suffering and dying son of David could not from its standpoint be conceded, it invented for this passage a second Messiah, "the Messiah, the son of Joseph," who was to fall in the conflict with Gog and Magog. Lastly, with respect to the passage Dan. ix. 24 sqq., the מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, who suffers the death which involves Jerusalem in destruction, is indeed understood by one set of interpreters of the Messiah (3). This is, however, opposed by the reference of the whole passage to the Maccabean period, as the connection certainly requires. The מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד who perishes is then regarded as the assassinated high priest Onias III., in which case, however, the passage would still have a typical reference to the Messiah (4).

(1) It cannot be disputed that the point of view which generally occupies the foreground in the description of the servant is not the completion of the kingship, but the fulfilment of Israel's national vocation. So also, in the description of the future glory of the church, Isa. lx. sq., the kingship is no longer mentioned.

(2) Isa. lv. 3 sqq. is now mostly explained so as to make it transfer the office of the race of David to the people. But it is also possible that he in whom David is to be a witness, leader, and commander to the people is the Messiah.

(3) [In the passage Zech. vi. 13, "the counsel of peace shall be between them both," the words "them both" must be referred to the two ideas of ruler and priest: the crowned one shall be ruler and priest, and thus there will be peace between the ruler and priest. Comp. Orelli on the passage. On the other hand, Böhl explains "between them both" = between Jehovah and the Branch.]

(4) See Hengstenberg, *Christology*, iii. p. 97 sqq.

(5) Comp. Orelli on the passage. On the Messianic doctrine of extra-canonical Judaism, see the article "Messias" in Herzog [and Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* § 29. On the history of Messianic interpretation in the Christian Church, comp. the work of Hengstenberg, *id.* iii. 132 sqq. ; see also § 213, note 9.]

PART III.

OLD TESTAMENT WISDOM (1).

§ 235.

General Preliminary Remarks.

The *Old Testament wisdom* (חָכְמָה, *Hhokhma*) forms, with the law and prophecy (though in co-operation with the latter), a special department of knowledge, to which three of the canonical books of the Old Testament, viz. Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, and, in virtue of their matter, many of the Psalms also, pre-eminently belong. The law gives the *commandments* and *claims* of Jehovah. Prophecy proclaims the *word* of the Lord, which reveals His counsels, by the light of which it explains and passes judgment upon the time then present, and discloses the object of God's mode of government. The Hhokhma does not in an equal manner refer its matter to direct Divine causation. It is true that a wise and understanding heart is the gift of God (comp. such passages as 1 Kings iii. 12. Eccles. ii. 26), and the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord (Prov. xx. 27) (2); but the proverb (מָשָׁל) of the wise is the product of his own experience and thought, as it is so frequently expressed, and not a word of God in the stricter sense of the term (3). The position of wisdom with respect to revelation is rather as follows. Upon the soil already formed by the facts of Divine revelation and the theocratic ordinances (4), springs up not merely a practical piety, but an *impulse for knowledge.* The Israelitish mind, reflecting upon the view of the world presented by revelation, and the life-task prescribed thereby, follows up such thoughts to their consequences, and thus seeks to acquaint itself with those subjects also which are not directly determined in revelation, striving especially to obtain light concerning those enigmas and contradictions of life which are at all times obtruding themselves. Thus arises what the Old Testament calls חָכְמָה. The original signification of the root חכם being, as appears from the Arabic *hhakama*, to make fast, to hold fast (5), the word Hhokhma implies that amidst phenomena man attains to something fixed and stable, which becomes a standard for his judgment. The Old Testament Hhokhma has been styled the *philosophy of the Hebrews.* And undoubtedly that portion of the Old Testament Scriptures which belongs to it is akin to the philosophy of other nations; for it does not concern itself with the ordinances and history of the theocracy, but takes as its subject, on the one hand, cosmical arrangements and natural life, and, on the

other, the moral relations of man. Hence these two provinces of the Hhokhma may be further compared with the physics and ethics of the Greeks; while, on the other hand, logic or anything analogous to it is not found in the Old Testament, nor even in the post-canonical Jewish wisdom (Ecclesiasticus and the Book of Wisdom), and first appears to some extent in the Talmud. Old Testament wisdom is nevertheless essentially different from other philosophy. Is is based, indeed, upon the observation of nature and of human affairs, and especially in the latter respect upon experience as handed down by the ancients; comp. how the sources of knowledge are described, Job xii. 7–12, v. 27, viii. 8 sq. (Isa. xl. 21, 28). In such investigations of nature and human life, however, it is placed under a regulative factor which Greek wisdom does not possess; it starts from a *supernaturalistic assumption* which the latter lacks. For the Greek philosophy seeks in the world itself the ultimate reasons and purposes of existence; but the knowledge of a living God transcending the world, of the almighty Creator and Governor of the world, of the holy Lawgiver and righteous Judge, is, for the Old Testament wisdom given in advance. Hence its aim is not, as Bruch very erroneously thinks (6), to present a wisdom discovered independently of revelation, and thus to place itself *above* revelation (7); nor, like the later Jewish, especially the Alexandrian, philosophy of religion, to combine a knowledge elsewhere obtained with the revealed teaching handed down, and to force upon the latter such interpretations as should accord with the former. Its mode of procedure, on the contrary, is to endeavor, by means of that key of knowledge which revelation affords, better to understand God's ways in the world, and, through the knowledge of God's will furnished by the law, better to determine the duties of human life. It never entered into the mind of the Old Testament sage to prove the existence of God; for, Ps. xiv., it was the fool (נָבָל) who said in his heart, There is no God. Hence, too, the ignorance with which Old Testament wisdom begins is of quite a different kind from the Socratic. Compare as chief passage in this respect the remarkable saying (Prov. xxx. 1 sqq.) of Agur, who, like Socrates, boasts of his ignorance as compared with the *μετεωρολόγους*. In ver. 1 the text must probably be altered (as Hitzig was the first to propose) to לְאִיתִי אֵל לְאִיתִי אֵל וְאֻכָל (8): "I troubled myself about God, troubled myself about God, and I vanished away," *i.e.* all his efforts to fathom the Divine Being produced nothing, so that he ironically declares himself, ver. 2 sq., beastly dull (בַּעַר מֵאִישׁ), one who has no human understanding, who has not learned wisdom, nor has the knowledge of the Holy. Ver. 4 then continues: "Who hath ascended up into heaven, and descended? who hath gathered the wind in His fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is His name, and what is His son's name, if thou canst tell?" The revealed word is now referred to as the source of knowledge, ver. 5: "Every word of God is pure: He is a shield to them that put their trust in Him. *Add thou not unto His words*, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Thus the Old Testament wisdom begins by abasing the self-sufficiency of natural knowledge, and giving glory to Divine revelation, *i.e.* it begins with the יִרְאַת יְהוָה [the fear of the Lord], as it so often designates its *subjective principle of knowledge* (comp. § 240) (9).

(1) Having already, in the description of the times of Solomon (§ 169), treated of the historical origin of the Hhokhma, we have now to lay down the essential features of its matter. Compare also my Programme: *Die Grundzüge der alttest. Weisheit*, 1854. [Further, Delitzsch, *Commentary on Proverbs*, Introduction, § 4. On the justification of the distinction between prophecy and Hhokhma, comp. § 16, also the thorough discussion of König, i. 194 sqq., which may be read in connection with this and the succeeding sections.]

(2) How all human intelligence is derived from the Divine Spirit, has been already described in the doctrine of the Spirit of God (§ 65).

(3) The passage Prov. xxx. 1 forms only an apparent exception. It is probable that מַשָּׂא here and xxx. 1 is a proper noun.

(4) We have repeatedly alluded to the fact that we have in the Old Testament revelation, comparatively little in the form of doctrine properly so called. The Divine thoughts which form its matter are for the most part impressed upon the historical facts by which they are effected, and upon the ordinances which they have enacted.

(5) See Schultens, *De defectibus hodiernis linguæ hebrææ*, p. 404 sqq. He considers the radical meaning of חָכְמָה to be *densa et firma compactio* = πυκνότης. But it is rather *a making fast;* hence, Arab. *hhākama, dijudicavit controversiam, decrevit, potestatem exercuit.* Comp. Kimchi on 1 Kings iii. 12: אמרו ר״יזל הכם המקיים את תלמודו כלומר כי מה שלמד מקויים בלבו ובזמן, *sapiens, inquiunt Rabbini nostri, quorum mem. bened. sit, ille est qui stare facit doctrinam suam, quasi dicas, quod quidquid docet, stabile est in corde ejus et paratum;* also Gusset: *sapientia non denotat cognitionem ipsam, sed modum ac gradum, quo quælibet cognitio inest animo.* [The word is explained differently by a reviewer of the first edition of this work in the *Litterar. Centralblatt*, 1874, No. 32: "The Hebrew terms expressive of ethical ideas go back continually to the heart as the seat of the intellectual and moral faculties. The Hhokhma is therefore firmness, *i.e.* ability of the heart and consequently both intellectual and practical wisdom, but it may also indicate wisdom in the concrete sense."]

(6) See Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, 1851; comp. especially p. 49.

(7) The Books of Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes not only presuppose the validity of the law; but even where doubt contends with the doctrine of retribution taught by the law, it is overcome—in the Book of Job by the corroboration of fresh facts, and in Ecclesiastes by a resigned acknowledgment of the legal standpoint; comp. §§ 248, 250.

(8) So, too, Zöckler in his excellent Commentary on Proverbs. [Delitzsch renders the passage in the same way, but takes אֵל as vocative.]

(9). [On the revelation in law as the source of wisdom, comp. König, i. 203 sq.]

§ 236.

Continuation.

But how now does the Hhokhma obtain an *objective principle of knowledge?*—The Israelitish mind, reflecting on the acts and ways of God as handed down, on the Divine ordinances by whose discipline it has been strengthened, and, comparing the law of Israel with the laws and statutes of heathenism, attains to the perception of their marvellous adaptation to their purpose. Comp. what is said Deut. iv. 6 of the Mosaic precepts and statutes (§ 84). This impression of the adaptation of the law to its purpose which the Israelitish mind received, is expressed in numerous passages of the Old Testament, Ps. cxlvii. 19 sq., xix. 8 sq. (1), but especially Ps. cxix., which proclaims in 176 verses the praises of the law. The Psalmist is conscious of the inexhaustible fulness which it offers to thoughtful

contemplation, when he prays, ver. 18, "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law" (2). From the perception of the adaptation of the theocratic ordinances to the purpose of their institution, the mind then advances to the thought of an *all-embracing and all-ruling purpose*. For the Lord of the theocracy is the Creator and Preserver of the universe, and the order of the covenant is based upon the order of the world. The man who is enlightened by the law, perceives in nature also a corresponding Divine adaptation to purpose; comp. *e.g.* how Ps. xix. compares the revelation of nature and the revelation of the law. It is the same *word* of God proclaimed in the theocracy as law and promise, which, as a word of command, called the world into existence, and energizes in all the phenomena of nature. See the passages xxviii. 6, comp. with ver. 4, cxlvii. 19 with ver. 15, and with cxlviii. 8, already cited in Pt. I., where the doctrine of the agency of the Divine word in creation is discussed (§ 50 and § 52 with note 3). The purposes and government of God being then recognized outside the theocracy also, the universe is regarded not as a mere product of the *power* of God, who can create what He *will* (cxv. 3, cxxxv. 6), but as the product of a Divine *plan*. Thus arises the thought of the Divine *wisdom* as the principle of the world; and this it is which is the *objective principle* of the Hhokhma. The task now presented to the Israelitish mind was to show that a Divine teleology exists everywhere, even beyond the boundary defined by the theocratic ordinances,—a task to which, in prospect of the inexhaustible fulness here offered, it devoted itself with delight. For if the Psalmist, when viewing the ways in which his own nation had been led, could exclaim, xcii. 5, "O Lord, how wondrous are Thy works! Thy thoughts are very deep!" he was also constrained, on contemplating God's other works, to exclaim, civ. 24, "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all!" and cxxxix. 17, "How precious are Thy thoughts unto me, O God! how great is the sum of them!" (3).

(1) Ps. cxlvii. 19 sq.: "He showed His word unto Jacob, His statutes and His judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation; and as for His judgments, they have not known them." *Ib.* xix. 7 sq.: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes."

(2) Ps. cxix. is a collection of maxims, alphabetically arranged for the purpose of assisting the memory, in which a systematic and progressive development of the several thoughts can hardly have been intended, however ingeniously the attempt to point out such a connection is made by Oetinger, Burk, and Delitzsch. On the other hand, it is certainly instructive to trace the association of ideas which may be recognized in the grouping of the separate sayings. The praise of God's word, as alone able to give peace and success; exhortations to unalterable fidelity thereto, even amidst shame and persecution; prayers to God for illumination, that God's precepts may be understood, and for strength that they may be fulfilled,—these and kindred subjects form the matter of these apothegms, which furnish an excellent testimony to the fact that a vigorous and heartfelt piety could strike root in that zeal for the law which was revived by the agency of Ezra. The psalm alludes also in several passages to the hostility, and even persecution, to which fidelity to the law was exposed.

(3) The *form* peculiar to Old Testament wisdom is the מָשָׁל (proverb). This expression is applied to maxims not merely in its narrower sense of a comparison, when these sayings actually contain similitudes and figurative language, but in

its more general meaning, when the experiences of life and the phenomena of nature are compared and used to illustrate each other. It is also used with still higher significance, all moral action being measured by its standard, viz. the Divine will. Thus Ps. lxxviii. also is, in ver. 2, designated as a מָשָׁל, because God's dealings with Israel are therein held forth as a mirror for warning and encouragement. According to its rudimental form, as sustained in the section Prov. x. 1–xxii. 16, the mashal consists of two members, the thought expressed in the one being in the second made evident by a comparison, or completed by a more elaborate explanation, or repeated in another aspect, or elucidated either by connection with some kindred idea, or by the bringing forward of its opposite. By such a combination of an object with its image, of something unknown with that which is more current, of the particular with the general in which it is to be included, or even with other particulars, for the sake of proving by such a juxtaposition of the homogeneous the universality of the rule, the judgment and intellect are awakened, and man is trained to observe the reasonable connection always existing between his actions and their results. The proverb requires concise and exact statement, in virtue of which it is adapted to impress itself deeply, and to remain fixed in the mind, "like goads and nails fastened," Eccles. xii. 11. This is promoted also by the *versification*, involving as it does such strict brevity of expression, the maxims in the collection Prov. x.–xxii. containing for the most part but seven words in both members, generally four in the first and three in the second. This purpose is also served by the recurrence of certain numbers (3, 4, 7, etc.), by an alphabetical arrangement met with in ch. xxxi. 10–13, (the description of the excellent woman), and in certain psalms, whose prevailing character is didactic (comp. especially Ps. xxxiv.). There is a rhetorical reason for the advance from lower to higher numbers (from 3 to 4, from 6 to 7) in certain numerical proverbs (Prov. vi. 16–19, xxx. 15 sq., 18–20, 21–23, 29–31), for it helps to increase the attention of the hearer, and to place the chief stress upon the last thought. The alphabetical arrangement, on the other hand, is a mere assistance to the memory, of the same kind as the numerous series of ten precepts found in the law (comp. § 85, note 5). The Proverbs, inasmuch as they arouse the moral judgment, and propound something to be found out, have also been called חִידוֹת, *riddles* (see especially Prov. i. 6), דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים וְחִידֹתָם, comp. Hab. ii. 6. That the latter expression does not merely designate the pointed form, but really means, as has been said, that something is to be found out, namely, the idea concealed behind the image, is shown by the use of the word in Judg. xiv. 12; 1 Kings x. 1; Ezek. xvii. 2; comp. also Num. xii. 8. The ethical meaning of the word, the fact that it is designed to arouse the moral judgment, is specially evident from Ps. xlix. 5, lxxviii. 2. [On the different forms of the proverb see Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Book of Proverbs*, introduction, § 2.]

FIRST SECTION.

OBJECTIVE DIVINE WISDOM.

§ 237.

The part of Wisdom as an Attribute of God in the Universe. Its Personification.

That the Divine intelligence, the Divine *νοῦς*, is employed in the creation and preservation of the universe, is laid down as a general proposition in Prov. iii. 19 sq.: "The Lord by wisdom (חָכְמָה) hath founded the earth, by understanding (תְּבוּנָה) hath He established the heavens. By His knowledge (דַּעַת) the depths are broken up, and the clouds drop down the dew." In other words, we every-

where find, as the passages cited in the preceding paragraph express it, the impress of the Divine *thoughts*. Though, however, in iii. 19 wisdom appears only as an *attribute* of God, the well-known passage viii. 22 sqq. goes further. Wisdom is there *personified*, and introduced as saying, "The Lord prepared me" (not possessed me, קָנָה signifying *comparavit*) "as the beginning of His way" (*i.e.* of His working and ruling), "before His works (קֶדֶם literally, as that which preceded His works) "of old (מֵאָז). I was set up from everlasting (1), from the beginning, or ever the earth was." Thus wisdom is brought forth before God created the world, and is established by Him to preside, as Ruler of the world, over that which He has created. For it is further said ver. 27–31 : "When He prepared the heavens, I was there ; when He set a circle upon the face of the deep, when He established the clouds above, when He strengthened the fountains of the deep, when He gave to the sea His decree that the waters should not pass His commandment, when He appointed the foundations of the earth, then was I (Wisdom) with Him as (אָמוֹן,) *superintendent* of His work (ver. 30 sq.), and I was a delight daily (2), sporting (A. V. rejoicing) always before Him, sporting upon His earth, and my delights were with the sons of men."—The fact that the creative agency of God results in a glad complacency in its production is here represented under the image of a willing and cheerful diversion on the part of the pre-mundane Hhokhma. It is, so to speak, a pleasure to the Creator to call the infinite abundance of the world into existence. Thus much, then, is certain, that even when full justice is done to the poetical element in the personification, wisdom is no longer to be regarded as a mere attribute of God, nor even as a dependent power, but as that creative, arranging, and energizing thought of the world which proceeds from God, and is objective even to Himself, or, to express it with Delitzsch in a more concrete manner, as the reflection of God's plan of the world, objective to Himself (3). That wisdom is objective, even with respect to God, is evident from Job xxviii. 12 sqq., the second chief passage in this matter, where, after it has been stated that man, though he is able to penetrate to the depths of the earth and bring to light hidden treasures, is yet incapable of discovering wisdom, and possessing himself of the Divine thought which determines the order of all things, ver. 23 sq. continues : "*God* understandeth the way thereof (*i.e.* of wisdom) and *He* knoweth the place thereof. For he looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven." As if to say : God alone, who surveys the whole creation according to both time and space, also perfectly knows the vital law which rules it, the thought which determines the infinite variety of the world. In vers. 25–27 it is further said : "When He gave weight to the winds, and weighed the waters by measure ; when He gave a law to the rain, and a way to the lightning of the thunder : then did He see her (Wisdom) and declare her (literally, numbered her,) prepared her and searched her out" (4). Here it is very evident that wisdom is the plan of the universe which proceeded from God, the summary of those thoughts according to which all things were fashioned, and which has itself become objective to God.

Looking upon this wisdom, God causes the fulness latent therein to come forth and be developed in the world : this is implied by the expression "He numbered it." The subsequent expression, "He searched it out," alludes to the depth of

the ideal contents latent in the Hhokhma. In both of these chief passages (Prov. viii. and Job. xxviii.) wisdom is the principle of the world laid down by God, and not a creature like the things in the world, its coming forth from God being, on the contrary, the presupposition of the world's creation (5). We cannot go further; but, as Nitzsch expresses it, we have here an unmistakable germ of the ontological self-distinction of the Godhead. How closely the Old Testament borders upon actually regarding wisdom as a personal existence, is shown more especially by the remarkable passage, Job xv. 7 sq., where Eliphaz says to Job, "Art thou the first man that was born? Hast thou heard the secret of God? and dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?" The meaning of the question, which is of course ironical, is: Art thou then the pre-mundane wisdom of God in the form of a primeval man, who, elevated like wisdom to communion with God, hast dived into His counsels, and thus mastered the knowledge of the principle by which the world is ordered? How are we here reminded of the ὧν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Θεοῦ, and how justly has Ewald found in this passage an echo of the subsequent idea of the Logos! (6).

(1) For thus must נִסַּכְתִּי be understood, as in Ps. ii. 6, and not as, I am anointed, nor, I am produced. Let it be remembered that נָסִיךְ the derivative of נָסַךְ signifies a liege lord.

(2) It may be doubted whether, His delight, or, Myself full of delight. Of late the latter meaning has been chiefly accepted: so also Delitzsch.

(3) [Comp. with Prov. viii. 22 sqq. Ecclesiasticus xxiv., also Baruch iii. 9 sqq.; Wisdom of Solomon ix. 9; for the connection between the New Testament representation of the Logos, and the idea of objective wisdom, Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 4 is especially to be consulted. While Reuss, § 403, regards Prov. viii. 22 sqq. as "already lying near the line of the later Jewish speculation, and therefore of post-exilic origin," Ewald's judgment (*Lehre von Gott*, iii. p. 77) is: "This is the highest sweep of philosophical thought in Israel in the prime of its free national life." The placing the law on the same level with wisdom in Ecclesiasticus, Ewald justly regards as indicative of the later origin of this book.]

(4) [Ver. 25 is by many connected with the preceding; by Dillmann with v. 24, by Hitzig with v. 23. Ewald and Dillmann render וַיְסַפְּרָהּ in v. 27, "and reviewed it over;" Hitzig: "and pronounced it" = gave to it the name of חָכְמָה.]

(5) Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 96 sqq., deviates considerably from this view of the passages cited. His view of Job xxviii. 20 sqq. especially is scarcely intelligible. He regards Job as speaking here not of the Divine wisdom, but only of the wisdom which man lacks; whence also the final ruin of the ungodly who now enjoy earthly prosperity is explained. This explanation is confuted by ver. 27.

(6) Perhaps, too, the "Son" of God in Prov. xxx. 4 may also be thus explained.

§ 238.

The Old Testament View of Nature.

The doctrine of an objective Divine wisdom, just discussed, being connected with the doctrine of omnipotence, which by means of the Divine word called the world into existence and sustains it, the world is not regarded merely as the product of power, but more definitely as the product of *an almighty will ordering all in conformity with its purpose*. Comp. how the notions of Divine wisdom and power are combined in Jer. x. 12, li. 15.) It is according to this principle that *the Old Testament view of nature* must be defined. It is true that this view also

admits that the universe was raised upon a chaos (upon the restrained forces of nature). But this chaos was not (as was shown, § 50, in the doctrine of creation) a principle originally independent of God ; nor did the Cosmos proceed from a struggle of the ruling principle against hostile and obscure forces, nor do such laboriously vanquished powers lurk in the background. Even in the poetical allusions to mythic representations of hostile and especially of sidereal powers in Job ix. 13, xxvi. 12 sq., the latter appear as totally incapable of resisting God. The ruling omnipotence is here placed, as we have said, above all. He who said to the sea, when it issued forth from the womb of the earth, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further ; and here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed," xxxviii. 11, is He who has subjected all that is in heaven and on earth to His חֻקּוֹת, His laws (ver. 33, comp. Jer. xxxi. 35, xxxiii. 35), and who makes the course of nature subserve His *purpose*. This purpose is, in general (see § 53), the manifestation of the Divine glory. Hence the whole course of the universe, from the hour of creation, when, according to Job xxxviii. 7, the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy, has been a continuous song of praise of this glory of God, a song in which all earthly creatures unite in one choir with the heavenly host, Ps. cxlviii. But the order of nature is further placed in close *connection with the moral order of the world*. What the Mosaic doctrine of retribution teaches (see § 89) concerning this connection, viz. that the course of nature subserves the purpose of Divine justice, is maintained to its full extent in the Hhokhma. It may here suffice to refer to the description in Job xxxvii. 12 sq., where God stands as it were in the midst of the elementary forces which rule in the storm, and where it is said : "He turns himself round about with His guidance, that they may do whatsoever He commandeth them, over the universe down to the earth, whether for a rod, when it is for the land, or whether for mercy He causeth it to come (upon the earth)" (1).

And yet that glory of God which man perceives in the world, that great teleological connection which he recognizes therein, is but a small portion of the whole, only a weak reflection of that glory. He finds, indeed, everywhere traces of the Divine wisdom, but he is not capable, as above remarked (§ 237), of fully comprehending it, Job xxxviii. The very abundance of that which he does know, makes him conscious that an infinitely greater abundance escapes his knowledge. "Lo, these are the *ends*, קְצוֹת, the barest outlines, as it were, of His ways ; and what is the whisper which we perceive, and the thunder of His power who can understand ?" are the words with which one of the most sublime descriptions in the Book of Job concludes (xxvi. 14, comp. xi. 7 sq.). The whole course of interrogation to which Job was subjected was calculated to bring him to a consciousness of the limits of human wisdom even in natural things, and especially with respect to the paradoxes of natural phenomena.

(1) [Many, with Dillmann and Hitzig, refer הוּא in ver. 12 to עָב and עָנָן in the preceding verse, "it (the cloud) turns itself hither and thither according to His direction."] The contents of many of the psalms touch on this matter, especially Ps. civ., to which I will not here further refer.

§ 239.

The Control of Wisdom in Human Affairs.

Not only nature, but *human affairs*, are controlled by wisdom as an objective Divine principle. That same wisdom which is the governing principle of the universe, has taken up its abode on earth, and rules as a sovereign all the events of life, in which a Divine design, and therefore Divine intelligence, is everywhere perceptible. And this is true without regard to the theocracy, with which the wisdom of the canonical books of the Old Testament does not concern itself. It is in the post-canonical monuments of Hebrew wisdom that we first find the objective wisdom regarded also as the principle of revelation in the stricter sense. It is thus viewed in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, where, in ch. xxiv. 10 sqq., instead of the presence of the Shekhina in the sanctuary we find the dwelling of the Divine *wisdom* upon Mount Zion. Wherever law and government exist in the world, they are an outcome of the Hhokhma. "By me" it is introduced as saying, Prov. viii. 16, "princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges upon earth." Very significantly is wisdom, when making itself known to men, called, Prov. i. 20, ix. 1, חָכְמוֹת, which must not be regarded, as by Ewald and Zöckler, as a singular form for חָכְמוּת, for חָכְמוֹת is construed not merely as a singular, but also as a plural. The expression denotes rather that the Divine wisdom includes all kinds of wisdom, and therefore especially the moral forces by which human life is directed. This Hhokhmoth, according to ix. 1 sqq., builds her house with seven pillars, and sends forth her maidens to the high places of the city to invite to her banquet. She herself also appears, i. 20 sqq., in the streets and public places of the town, and calls the ignorant to come unto her. This may, as already remarked, § 169, refer in the first place to the fact that in the public places, where justice was administered and public business transacted, sages were wont to speak and prophets to preach, etc. ; but it also implies generally that the appeals of Divine wisdom are ever being uttered to man in all human transactions, and even in the ordinary events of life ; that to all who will but see and hear, the wise, righteous, and holy government of God makes itself evident. If we inquire more closely *as to the means by which wisdom makes her appeal to man*, i. 23 again points to those factors of revelation, the word and the Spirit : "Behold, I will pour out my *Spirit* upon you ; I will make known my *words* unto you." And indeed the word is the vehicle of the Spirit. The effect of this upon men is first designated as *instruction*, מוּסָר. The idea of instruction is one of the fundamental ideas of the Proverbs of Solomon,—one of the seven pillars (ix. 1), as Oetinger says, upon which the house of wisdom is supported. Wisdom and instruction are inseparably connected, i. 2, 7, xxiii. 23 ; the way to wisdom is called, i. 3, a reception of instruction (xix. 20). The preservation of wisdom is only possible by taking fast hold of instruction, iv. 13, x. 17, etc. The idea of מוּסָר must by no means be weakened and reduced, as is often the case, to the notion of *doctrina*, *institutio*, since it is evident from iii. 11 that the word is also used for the discipline of sorrow, in xiii. 24, xxii. 15, for the correction of children, and that instruction begins with תּוֹכַחַת. תּוֹכַחַת, from הוֹכִיחַ = *ἐλέγχειν*, is the admonition, which both convinces and rebukes, of i.

23, xxv. 30, and many subsequent passages. For the connection of the two ideas see iii. 11, v. 12, x. 17, xii. 1, xiii. 18, xv. 5, and elsewhere. Consequently it is with this instruction or reproof that the educational agency of wisdom upon man must begin ; for man is by nature ignorant of the way of salvation, and easily seduced to evil, or, as the expression is, פֶּתִי (*i.e.* one standing open), *simple ;* comp. i. 4, 22, and other passages. Hence the worthlessness of his natural efforts must be revealed to him by the light of God's law, and he must be convinced of the perniciousness of those ungodly ways in which he is walking. He who will not be convinced, who in his self-sufficiency will not receive the reproofs of instruction, nay, hates them, shows himself thereby to be a *fool*, כְּסִיל (אֱוִיל), nay בַּעַר, xii. 1, brutish, and is in his incorrigibleness hastening to irretrievable ruin (i. 24 sqq., xiii. 18, etc.). He who fears God, on the other hand, submits to this reproof of instruction, resolutely turns from those evil ways to which his natural inclinations and the evil example of others seek to seduce him, and so walks in the way of wisdom, i. 8 sqq. Thus, after tracing the control of objective wisdom, we come to its subjective point of departure.

SECOND SECTION.

SUBJECTIVE HUMAN WISDOM.

§ 240.

The Fear of the Lord the Subjective Principle of Wisdom.

The subjective principle of wisdom is, then, the fear of the Lord : "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge, Prov. i. 7 ; "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," ix. 10 ; comp. Ps. cxi. 10, Job xxviii. 28. This fear of the Lord is not, as Hegel, *e.g.*, has defined it (1), a blind, gloomy, passive religious emotion, produced merely by the idea of an absolute power which utterly negatives human nature as such,—a definition applicable to the fear of God only in the sense of Islam, a system which renounces all free self-determination. The fear of Jehovah is rather, as it is called Prov. ix. 10, דַּעַת קְדֹשִׁים, "*the knowledge of the All-Holy.*" The Divine holiness, however, is, as was shown in Pt. I. (§ 45), absolute perfection, not merely in the sense of separateness from all created beings, and incomparable exaltation above them, in virtue of which it passes the sentence of vanity upon all that is finite, but still more decidedly in that of separateness from all the impurity and sinfulness of the creature. But it is not this alone ; for God, as the Holy One, is not only separate from the world, but also imparts Himself thereto, for the purpose of abolishing its sin, and giving it a share in His perfection ; in pursuance of which design He has sanctified to Himself a people, *i e.* separated them from the world and taken them as a possession, and these He leads and governs in conformity with His plan of salvation.

This Divine holiness addresses itself, in that law which reveals the perfect will of God, to the free will of man. Consequently the fear of the Lord, as the knowledge of the All-Holy, has nothing to do with this gloomy passivity ; but—presupposing the covenant relation into which He has entered with His people

—is based upon that will of God which opposes all selfish and sinful human efforts, and appoints, in conformity with His purpose of salvation, an end and measure to all things; it is the dread of disobeying this holy will of God. Hence it involves, according to the just definition of its moral characteristics, viii. 13, "hatred of evil, pride, arrogancy, and the evil way." From this fear of God proceeds also the effort, first, to *perceive* in everything the end designed by the Divine will; and, secondly, to realize it in every action, as it is said, ch. iii. 6, "In all thy ways acknowledge Him." The former may be called theoretical, the latter practical wisdom. Thus the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom, whose starting-point accordingly is not the autonomy of the reason and the will, which would be that very leaning on our own understanding, that being wise in our own eyes, against which we are so earnestly warned, *e.g.* iii. 5, 7 (comp. xii. 15, etc). The wise man, on the contrary, shares in the restraints and obligations imposed on the servants of God (2), and is at all times and under all circumstances conscious of them. It is in this sense that it is said, xxviii. 14, "Happy is the man that feareth always (מְפַחֵד תָּמִיד)," *i.e.*, lest he transgress the will of God, in contrast with the מְקַשֶּׁה לִבּוֹ, the man who hardens himself against God's commands in the service of sin. The wise man's servitude is not, however, a slavish one, but rather a relation of intimacy with God, Ps. xxv. 14. The friendship (*familiaritas*) of the Lord is for them that fear Him (סוֹד יְהוָה לְיִרְאָיו), with which compare the saying in Prov. iii. 32 (אֶת־יְשָׁרִים סודו).

§ 241.

Practical Wisdom.

Subjective wisdom, though by no means excluding theoretical questions (1), is yet for the most part *practical*, and bent upon accomplishing the holy will of God in human life. Since, however, this will of God aims not only at the external consecration of the life, but also at the *sanctification of the heart and temper* (2), the ethics of the Old Testament doctrine of wisdom do not treat only, as has been so often supposed, of a restoration of an external legality of conduct. The following comparison of passages from both may suffice to show that there is in this respect no difference between the Psalms and the precepts of the Hhokhma. The Psalmist, Ps. cxxxix. 23, prays to the all-knowing God: "Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts." And David says, li. 6: "Behold, Thou desirest truth in the inward parts, and in *the hidden* part Thou shalt make me know wisdom," which probably refers to inward sincerity and purity (3); and prays to God for forgiveness of sin, for inward cleansing and renewing, that this state of heart may be induced; and, finally, in Ps. xxxii., penitent confession of sin and the seeking of pardon from God are required as the indispensable conditions of the way of salvation, and their opposites designated as brutish irrationality. With all this the ethics of the Book of Proverbs entirely agree, by seeking to arouse the fear of God, the all-seeing Searcher of hearts, as the following passages show: (xv. 11) "Hell and destruction are before the Lord; how much more, then, the hearts of the children of men?" (xvi. 2) "All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes; but the Lord weigheth (תֹּכֵן)

the spirits," *i.e.* tests them according to their value; (xvii. 3) "The fining pot is for silver, and the furnace for gold; but the Lord trieth the hearts." Among the seven things that the Lord hateth is, vi. 18, "a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations." In xx. 9 *conviction of sin* is required: "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?"—words which are not to be explained: I have from my birth maintained purity of heart; they really *deny* (Zöckler) man's purity and freedom from sin, as expressed Eccles. vii. 20: "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not." Hence Prov. xxviii. 13 declares the duty of *confessing sin*, and the happiness of obtaining *forgiveness:* "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." Sacrifice, as a mere *opus operatum*, is rejected, xv. 8: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord" (xxi. 27), comp. xxi. 3 (4); as it is also said, Eccles. v. 1, that to go into the house of God to hear is better than when fools bring a sacrifice. Thus it is evident why, among the exhortations in Prov. iv. 23 sqq., this is placed first: "Keep thy *heart* with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life;" *i.e.*, as the heart, whence the blood flows, and to which it returns, is the abode of physical life, so with respect to man's moral life, everything, after all, depends upon the heart, the disposition of man. [The passage may be rendered: "more than all that thou guardest." So the Dutch version: "above all that is to be guarded."—D.] Then follow the precepts: "Put away from thee a froward mouth, and perverse lips put far from thee," etc. The catalogue of Job's virtues in Job xxxi., from which, indeed (in keeping with the progress of the poem), humility is absent, bears nevertheless testimony to the view of moral excellence as having its seat in the disposition (5).

(1) Evidence of this is given in § 237, where the doctrine of the Divine wisdom as the principle of the arrangement of the world is discussed. Further on it will be shown (§ 245 f.) how Old Testament wisdom, following up the thought of the law, arrives at metaphysical problems, and produces a religious speculation, which struggles to break through the limits of Old Testament revelation, and to work its way to a higher knowledge.

(2) Comp. the doctrine of the law, § 84.

(3) I now thus explain Ps. li. 6 with the most recent expositors, and abandon the view given in my Programme, p. 10 (on the disclosure of the deeper meaning of the law), already cited.

(4) Prov. xxi. 3: "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice;" in which passage, however, as well as in kindred passages from the Psalms and Prophets, no absolute rejection of sacrificial service is expressed; comp. § 201 (see Programme cited).

(5) This chapter contains many parallels with the Sermon on the Mount.

§ 242.

Continuation.

Notwithstanding what has been said, it must be confessed that the wisdom of the Proverbs is chiefly concerned with the sphere of the *external* life, and that its main purpose is to point out, in all the relations of civil and domestic life, down to the circumstances of ordinary intercourse, the course of action conformable to

the will of God, and thus to apply the saying, Prov. iii. 6 : בְּכָל־דְּרָכֶיךָ דָּעֵהוּ, "In all thy ways *Deum respice et cura.*" The wise man proves himself to be such by living like one who is constantly reflecting on the purposes of God. Hence בִּינָה, the gift of discerning between good and evil, the harmful and the salutary ; מְזִמָּה, the intelligence always able to counsel aright ; עָרְמָה, cunning in its nobler sense of skill in the choice of the means best fitted to the end in view,—are declared to be the prominent virtues of the wise. The quality mentioned i. 5, תַּחְבֻּלוֹת, the art of steering, the power of wisely directing one's course of life, is very characteristic. The ethics of the Proverbs are certainly, in virtue of their principle, viz. the fear of violating God's will, of an undeniably *negative character*, and present, by reason of the constant reflection upon the end designed by that will which they require, an appearance of coldness and extreme moderation. The impelling power of love is wanting as a motive (comp. § 84). We should seek in vain in Proverbs for such sayings as, "I heartily love Thee, O Lord, my strength," Ps. xviii. 1 (lxxiii. 25 sq.), etc. Enthusiasm is alien to the sage, as possibly involving an element unsuited to the purpose to be attained ; while everything tending to disturb the prescribed equilibrium—all rashness and precipitation—are utterly detested by him. It is said, xiv. 15 : "The simple believeth every word ; but the prudent (עָרוּם) looketh well to his going ;" xiv. 29 : "He that is slow to wrath is of great understanding ; but he that is hasty of spirit showeth much folly." Hence it is especially words and gestures which the wise man must control,—xi. 12 sq. : "He that is void of wisdom manifests contempt for his neighbor ; but a man of understanding holdeth his peace. A talebearer revealeth secrets ; but he that is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter ;" x. 10 : "He that winketh with the eye (a gesture expressing derision) causeth sorrow ; and a prating fool shall fall (rushes to destruction)." Death and life are declared, xviii. 21, to be in the power of the tongue.

In consequence of this negative character, it is rather *justice* than love which is the *duty a man owes to his neighbor ;* it has even been made a matter of reproach against the ethics of these maxims, that they sometimes border upon the recommendation of a selfish prudence. It must not, however, be forgotten, in considering the frequent warnings against suretyship, vi. 1–4, xi. 15, 17, xviii. 22, 26 sq., which are here referred to, that in the then existing state of law, indiscretion in this respect might involve even the loss of personal liberty. There is a marked difference between the Book of Proverbs and the son of Sirach who, in the midst of many admirable precepts, does appeal in an actually offensive manner, to selfish motives. Nor is the former book without numerous maxims which relate to the practice of those duties resulting from the *principle of love*, placability being inculcated, *e.g.*, x. 12 ; the love of enemies, xxv. 21 sq. ; peaceableness, xvii. 14, xx. 3 ; gentleness and patience, xv. 1, 18 ; forbearance to the poor, xxii. 22, in impressing which last named virtue, it is expressly stated that their Creator is honored in the poor, xiv. 31, xvii. 3 (1). The state of the man who devotes himself to wisdom is designated by the word תּוּשִׁיָּה. This expression, which is peculiar to the Hhokhma, is derived from יֵשׁ (*ὑπάρχειν*), and hence properly denotes *essentiality*, *reality* (2). It is used in both a subjective and objective sense,—in the former, parallel with חָכְמָה, along with עֵצָה, מְזִמָּה, בִּינָה, גְּבוּרָה,

comp. such passages as iii. 21, viii. 14; in an objective sense with עֶזְרָה, help, Job vi. 13, and with מָגֵן, shield, Prov. ii. 7. The expression is used to signify that, while fools consume themselves in vain efforts, and hence obtain only that which is worthless, the wise man, on the contrary, has something real and firm in his feelings and actions (3), and so obtains possession of that which is solid and enduring. And this brings us to the statement of what that good is wherein the reward of wisdom consists.

(1) Similar passages will be found in the 31st chapter of the Book of Job, quoted in the preceding section.

(2) [So the word is explained by Dillmann on Job v. 12, while Hitzig on the passage, and also on Prov. iii. 21, going back to the stem שָׁוָה *to be even, like*, makes the word signify the agreement of the being with the thinking, and of the thinking with the being; it would then mean, the hitting the right thing. Delitzsch on Prov. ii. 7 rejects this latter explanation, because it wanders over, without necessity, to another etymology; but against the derivation from יָשַׁשׁ he objects that no analogy supports such a formation, and that the י in יָשַׁשׁ does not represent a ו. He explains תּוּשִׁיָּה as a Hiphil formation from הוֹשָׁה = to bring about, to further, and so comes to the fundamental meaning of "furtherance."]

(3) Because the Divine purpose is that which alone is stable and the wise man alone aims at this Divine purpose, Prov. xix. 21: "There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand."

THIRD SECTION.

MORAL GOOD.

§ 243.

Its Realization in the Individual Life.

The teaching of the Hhokhma concerning the possession of earthly good is entirely based upon the Mosaic doctrine of retribution. What this expresses as the *shall* of promise and threatening, is announced in Proverbs as a fact, and that with the assurance arising from direct *experience*. Comp. *e.g.* xiii. 21: "Evil pursueth sinners; but to the righteous good shall be repaid;" ver. 9: "The light of the righteous rejoiceth; but the lamp of the wicked is put out." A number of sayings on this subject are found in the speeches of the three friends of Job, who explicitly aim to exhibit the actual reality of the Divine law of retribution. The sum-total of earthly good is *life*, its opposite *death;* and these are often contrasted with each other, *e.g.* Prov. viii. 35 sq., where Wisdom says: "Whoso findeth me findeth life: . . . . he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death." Comp. xi. 19, also xiii. 14: "The teaching of the wise is a fountain of life, to depart from the snares of death." That the life, which is the reward of wisdom, is regarded both in Proverbs and in the legal doctrine of retribution as earthly and of this world, is generally admitted; the question, however, is whether the *teaching of Proverbs is limited thereto.* Ewald, in particular, asserts the contrary; Proverbs, in his opinion, teaches a happy life in another world. Here it must first of all be regarded as worthy of

notice that the Proverbs make mention of Sheol, the realm of shades (רְפָאִים), only when speaking of the final lot of the wicked. It is thither that the paths of the adulteress lead, ii. 18, v. 5, vii. 27, ix. 18; while not a word is said of the passing of the pious and the wise, also, into Sheol. Nay, there are even positive statements which appear to raise the wise above this doom. The first of these passages is xii. 28: "In the way of righteousness is life, and in its pathway (דֶּרֶךְ נְתִיבָה) is non-death" (אַל־מָוֶת, that is, as Ewald and Delitzsch say, immortality). We should indeed have expected לֹא מָוֶת (1). Hitzig and Zöckler, on the contrary, read with the LXX אָל, and render the clause, But a by-path (?) leads to death (2). A second passage is xiv. 32: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death" (בְּמוֹתוֹ). But here the LXX have another reading, their text probably having been בְּתָמּוֹ ("has confidence in his innocence"), which would hinder the passage from furnishing any evidence in this matter. Another is xv. 24, the translation of which is certain: "The way of life is upward to the wise, to escape hell beneath." Also when it is said, xi. 7: "When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish; and the hope of the unjust perisheth," does it not seem to be pointed out, that when a just man dieth, his hope does not perish, which is indeed interpolated by the LXX as the first clause of ver. 7? (3). According to the Masoretic text, however, the contrast is found in ver. 8: "The righteous is delivered out of trouble; and the wicked cometh in his stead." The circumstance, however, which especially makes such an explanation [of these passages] doubtful is, that in these very passages, in which the notion of life as the reward of wisdom is so clearly stated, there is not even a trace of an allusion to a future and better life. For instance in iii. 18, wisdom is declared, with evident reference to Gen. ii. 9, iii. 22, to be a tree of life; but its fruit is represented, ver. 16 (see below), not as *eternal* life, but only as length of days (אֹרֶךְ יָמִים); and the *contrast* to the passage Prov. ii. 18 sq., where it is said of the adulteress, "Her house inclineth unto death, and her paths unto the dead: none that go unto her . . . take hold of the paths of life" (comp. ver. 6), is only (ver. 21) "the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it," while the wicked are to be rooted out. Compare also x. 30 and other passages (4). Accordingly, the passages xii. 28 and xv. 24, even if the Masoretic punctuation of the former is adopted, only refer to the Divine promise of a long and prosperous earthly life; while the passage xiv. 32*b*, if the Masoretic text is accepted, must be explained either of the trust of the righteous in the midst even of extreme peril, or of such a confidence on the part of the dying righteous man in the future prosperity of his descendants, as Jacob manifested, Gen. xlix. 18, or in the honoring of his memory in the sense of Prov. x. 7 (5). The passages brought forward by Ewald from the Proverbs are of the same kind as many in the Psalms which were referred by older theologians to life eternal, as xxvii. 3: "To see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living;" cxlii. 5: "Thou art my refuge and my portion in the land of the living"—which explanation has been long considered erroneous. Upon the whole it is worthy of note how the Book of Proverbs draws, so to speak, a veil over the state of the righteous in Hades. But in general, it is certain, as already remarked, that wisdom proffers earthly possessions: "Length of days is in her right hand, and in her left, riches and honor."

Hence the doctrine of the Hhokhma has often been designated as pure Eudemonism, *i.e.* as teaching that wisdom and righteousness are but means for the attainment of earthly prosperity as the proper object of life. The state of the matter is, however, as follows. As even the legal doctrine of retribution culminates, according to Lev. xxvi. 3 sqq., in the promise of the dwelling of God among His people, and the direct intercourse into which He will enter with them, and as consequently there can be from the Mosaic standpoint no earthly prosperity apart from communion with God (see § 89); so also does wisdom, in virtue of its principle, the fear of God, repudiate all earthly aims and interests, *so far as these, apart from the Divine purpose and pursued for their own sake*, constitute the end for which man lives. It could not, in fact, be more distinctly stated than it is in the Book of Proverbs that it is culpable to make earthly prosperity, in and for itself, the object of life. Comp. the following passages on riches: xi. 4, 28, xv. 16, etc. (6). In what sense, then, is it that earthly possessions are, on the other hand, represented as things to be striven after? In the following: that while it would be folly to seek them for their own sake, it is, on the contrary, wisdom to seek them as a good consistent with, and involved in, the Divine purposes; that they are to be received as tokens and pledges of the *Divine complacency*, as a blessing which God has combined with righteousness as its reward, and consequently that God is to be honored by them. It is in this manner that all, even the seemingly contradictory passages of the Proverbs, are to be harmonized, viz. those which on the one side declare wisdom to be the most desirable of all possessions, more precious than pearls, and incomparably surpassing all that can be desired (iii. 15 comp. with xvi. 16, etc.), and those which, on the other side, extol earthly prosperity, *e.g.* praising the righteous because there is much treasure in his house, xv. 6, etc. The beautiful passage xxx. 7–9 (7) may especially be mentioned, as showing how earthly prosperity is ever to be prized only in proportion as it is accompanied by godly and righteous conduct.

(1) [Delitzsch on xii. 28, remarks: "If we compare (with this passage) xiv. 32*b*., it is clear that the Hhokhma begins to break through the limits of time and the world, which confined the knowledge of salvation to the present, and to announce a life which strips death of its power."]

(2) Vulg.: *iter autem devium ducit ad mortem;* in corroboration of which, Judg. v. 6, where נְתִיבוֹת, as contrasted with אֳרְחוֹת, means *by-ways*, and Jer. xviii. 15, where דֶּרֶךְ לֹא סְלוּלָה corresponds with נְתִיבוֹת, may certainly be appealed to. But the word signifies simply a narrow footpath; hence it is questionable whether it ought to be taken in so pregnant a sense.

(3) Prov. xi. 7*a*, LXX: *τελευτήσαντος ἀνδρὸς δικαίου οὐκ ὄλλυται ἐλπίς.* Zöckler, too, finds this meaning in the passage.

(4) Prov. x. 30: "The righteous shall never be removed; but the wicked shall not inhabit the land" (comp. ver. 25); ver. 27: "The fear of the Lord prolongeth days; but the years of the wicked shall be shortened."

(5) Prov. x. 7: "The memory of the just is blessed; but the name of the wicked shall rot."

(9) Prov. xi. 4: "Riches profit not in the day of wrath; but righteousness delivereth from death;" ver. 28: "He that trusteth in his riches shall fall; but the righteous shall flourish as a branch;" xv. 16: "Better is little with the fear of the Lord, than great treasure and trouble therewith." It is easy to find many more proverbs of this kind.

(7) Prov. xxx. 7–9 : "Two things have I required of Thee, deny me them not before I die : Remove far from me vanity and lies ; give me neither poverty nor riches ; feed me with food convenient for me : lest I be full, and deny Thee, and say, Who is the Lord ? or lest I be poor, and steal, and take the name of my God in vain."

§ 244.

Realization of Moral Good in the Various Social Spheres. The View taken in Proverbs of Evil and Pain.

Moral good is not realized in individual life alone, but also in *the various social spheres*. And here it is first of all the sphere of the family, of domestic life, that claims our consideration, domestic happiness being the chief of those good things with which the fear of God is rewarded. Both the *conjugal* and the *parental* relations are regarded by the Hhokhma with a moral and religious seriousness, the like of which is not found in any one of the nations of antiquity. Marriage is designated, Prov. ii. 17, as a *covenant of God* (1). "House and riches are the inheritance of fathers ; but a prudent wife is from the Lord," xix. 14 (2) ; comp. also xii. 4, xviii. 22 (3). The description of such a wife, xxxi. 10 sqq., terminates, ver. 30, with the words, "Favor is deceitful, and beauty is vain ; but a woman that feareth the Lord she shall be praised." No sin is more frequently or more sharply reproved in Proverbs than the violation of conjugal fidelity ; see ii. 12 sqq., ch. v., vi. 23 sqq., and the entire seventh chapter. *Solomon's Song* may also be referred to ; for even if it is not regarded as a satire on polygamy, it very decidedly views conjugal love as a unique relation when compared with the polygamy which it presupposes, vi. 9, and speaks, viii. 6, of a love strong as death, whose jealousy is as hard as the grave, whose coals are coals of fire, a flame of the Lord. With this corresponds the appreciation of the *blessing of children*. Descendants are indeed the glory of a house (4), but only, as is frequently stated, when children are wise and walk in the fear of God ; see Prov. x. 1, xvii. 21, xxiii. 24, xxvii. 11, etc. (5). Hence it is expressly required that children be carefully trained, by strict discipline and religious and moral instruction (6).

Not only domestic but *political* life, and *well-ordered civil institutions*, are regarded as component parts of moral good. All earthly authority is, as already remarked (§ 239), an emanation of the Divine wisdom. The view that kings and judges are the organs of the Divine government of the world, and vicegerents of the Supreme Ruler and Judge, and that as such they are appointed to administer justice, especially by executing severe judgment upon the wicked, forms the foundation of a whole series of proverbs ; comp. xvi. 12–15, xx. 8, 26, xxv. 5, xxix. 4 (7). For "where there is no guidance (תַּחְבֻּלוֹת), a nation falls," xi. 14. The prosperity of a nation, however, depends upon its possession of the word of God, of the law and prophecy. "Where there is no prophecy, the people perish ; but he that keepeth the law, happy is he," xxix. 18 (8). All political wisdom is comprised in the saying : "Righteousness exalteth a nation ; but sin is a reproof to any people," xiv. 34. In xxviii. 12, 15 sq., we are told how a blessing or a curse falls upon a people, according to the character of its government. Hence numerous good counsels are given to kings, *e.g.* xxix. 12, 14 : "If a ruler hearken unto

lies, all his servants are wicked. The king that faithfully judgeth the poor, his throne shall be established for ever." Comp. also xxxi. 1–9, etc.

When every department of life thus combines to subserve the Divine purpose, the Israelitish mind feels satisfied. That there is so much *evil* in the world, is indeed a thought which disturbs it when contemplating the beauty and order of the universe, comp. Ps. civ. 35 (§ 53); but evil being regarded in its connection with that Divine judgment that awaits it and manifests the justice and holiness of God, becomes itself an element of the Divine teleology: "The Lord hath made all things for Himself, yea, even the wicked for the day of evil," Prov. xvi. 4. Those irregularities which do not harmonize with the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, are reconciled by their connection with the whole; the *suffering*, from which the wise and righteous is not exempt, working as a means of Divine discipline for his good. The proverb iii. 11 sq. says: "My son, despise not the chastening of the Lord, neither be weary of His correction: for whom the Lord loveth He correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth" (9). There is no trace here of that heart-agitating conflict depicted in the Book of Job. This is not to say that the contradictions which Old Testament life bears within itself are reconciled. To the finite, value is attached so far as it is incorporated into the Divine order of things: but in its finiteness it is not wholly and altogether decried. As the possession of the wise, it is placed in a different point of view from that from which the fool and the ungodly contemplate it; but it does not reach the realization of man's eternal destiny. Of this eternal destiny the Hhokhma of the Proverbs is not able to speak, at least with clearness (10), and does but draw a veil over death and Sheol. To the Old Testament wisdom, however, it was assigned to uncover these unreconciled contradictions, and to fight out such a mental conflict as has been fought out by the wisdom of no other nation. How this struggle arose will next demand our attention.

(1) *I.e.*, as a covenant entered into before God and with His intervention. Thus Hitzig aptly quotes by way of illustrating the saying of Jonathan, 1 Sam. xx. 23: "And as touching the matter which thou and I have spoken of, behold, the Lord be between thee and me for ever." Comp. Mal. ii. 14 (§ 102). That marriages, as Ewald *in loc.* thinks, were not concluded without the sacred rites of the public religion, cannot be proved from the Old Testament.

(2) *I.e.*, as Hitzig again well and briefly remarks, marriages are made in heaven.

(3) According to Prov. xviii. 22, to have found a good wife is a token of the Divine favor.

(4) Comp. Prov. xvii. 6: "Children's children are the crown of old men."

(5) Prov. x. 1: "A wise son maketh a glad father; but a foolish son is the heaviness of his mother;" xvii. 21: "He that begetteth a fool, doeth it to his sorrow; and the father of a fool hath no joy;" xxiii. 24: "The father of the righteous shall greatly rejoice, and he that begetteth a wise child shall have joy of him;" xxvii. 11: "My son, be wise, and make my heart glad, that I may answer him that reproacheth me;" in other words, well brought up children are the best vindication of a father against the attacks of slanderers. Comp. also xxviii. 7, xxix. 3.

(6) The standing model for *the education of children* is the method adopted by the Divine wisdom (see § 239). This is divided into two parts,—*discipline*, taking the word in its narrower sense, and *instruction*, on which account it is required of the teacher that he should himself apply his heart to discipline, and his ears

to the words of knowledge, Prov. xxiii. 12. For this saying forms the introduction to vers. 13–16; and Oetinger correctly states the connection to be, "As thou bringest up thyself, so wilt thou also bring up thy children." Above all the natural evil inclination of the child, "the foolishness which is bound in the heart of a child" (xxii. 15), is to be restrained by strict *discipline*. "The rod and reproof give wisdom; but a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame" (xxix. 15). Stripes, which are spoken of as a fit means for encountering folly and wickedness in general (x. 13, xx. 30), are repeatedly demanded for the chastisement of children. He who spares the rod is said to hate the child; while true love for it is manifested by strict discipline, because the child is thereby saved from ruin, xiii. 24, xxiii. 13 sq. "Correct thy son, and he shall give thee rest; yea, he shall give delight unto thy soul" (xxix. 17). A distinction is, however, made between the case in which verbal reproof and that in which corporal chastisement is required: "A reproof entereth more into a wise man than an hundred stripes into a fool" (xvii. 10); "Smite a scorner, and the simple will beware; and reprove one that hath understanding, and he will understand knowledge" (xix. 25). The knowledge, then, for the reception of which discipline is to open the understanding, is of a religious and moral nature; and the *instruction* spoken of in the Proverbs is designed to lead to the knowledge and fear of God, whence proceeds the understanding of righteousness, judgment, and equity, and every good path (comp. as chief passage, ii. 1–9). The young are to be instructed in the Divine word. It is not as written that the word of God is made by Proverbs to be authoritative; it comes rather to a son from the *mouth* of his parents. The commands of parents have the authority of the Divine law; and the promises made to the fulfilment of the Divine commandments depend upon their observance. Comp. i. 8, "My son, hear the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother," where the combination of reverence for parents with the principle of the fear of God expressed ver. 7 should be noted. Also iv. 3 sq.: "I was my father's son, tender and only beloved in the sight of my mother" (*i.e.* the true relation which ought to exist between parents and children was found in me). "He taught me also, and said unto me, Let thy heart retain my words; keep my commandments, and live." Comp. also vi. 20 sqq., where it should be remarked that the law of the mother is placed side by side with the commandment of the father, and a share in the moral and religious training of the son is thus assigned to the former. In this passage, what was said in Deut. vi. 7 (§ 105) of the keeping of the Divine law is transferred to parental instruction. "Bind them continually upon thine heart, and tie them about thy neck. When thou goest, it shall lead thee; when thou sleepest, it shall keep thee; and when thou awakest, it shall talk with thee" (or perhaps more correctly, "make thee reflect," *i.e.* it shall be thy first thought in the morning). Disobedience to parents entails heavy judgments, the doom of the transgressor awaiting him who despises them (xxx. 17, comp. xx. 20). Parents are also warned to begin the instruction of their children betimes, and thus to train them for their whole life: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Special regard is to be had to the doings of a child, since by them it may be perceived "whether his nature be pure, and whether it be right" (xx. 11). In such subjection of youth to a sacred authority, that strict discipline of law by which God trains His people is repeated: "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth" (Lam. iii. 27). A complete statement of the educational precepts given in the Proverbs would here be out of place. It may suffice to point out, in addition to what has already been said, how earnestly *diligence* is insisted on, and sloth branded as a contemptible thing (vi. 6–11, x. 26, xv. 19, xix. 15, 24, xx. 4, 13, xxvi. 13–16); how *temperance* (xiii. 25, xxiii. 19–21) and *chastity* are required, and temptations to unchastity warned against (vii. 5 sqq., xxiii. 26–28). On the position taken by Old Testament teaching with respect to bodily exercise, see the article "Pädagogik d. A. T." in Schmid's *Pädagogischer Encyklop.* v. p. 683. The education of *girls* is never separately treated of in Proverbs. It is a self-evident assumption that they too were instructed in the

law, though this is first expressly stated in the apocryphal Book of Susannah, ver. 3. The end contemplated in female education may be perceived from the description of the excellent woman in Prov. xxxi. 10 sqq., and the passages xi. 16, 22, xii. 4, etc. Modesty and moral tact (צְנִיעוּת, xi. 22; Hitzig: "An acute sense of decorum, chiefly manifested in modesty of speech, look, and conduct") are the ornaments of woman. Isa. iii. 16 sqq. is an earnest reproof of the daughters of Zion for their pride, luxury, and love of dress. Constant occupation, industry, benevolence, and liberality are the chief features of the description Prov. xxxi., which also shows that skill in handiwork of all kinds was then a part of female education. But here also the instruction of wisdom is true to its principle, ver. 30 (see above). For the literature of Old Testament education, see the article cited, p. 653 sq.

(7) Comp. Stier, who has written separate works on two sections of the Proverbs, one on ch. xxv. sqq., with the title, *Der Weise ein König*, the other on ch. xxx. sq., entitled *Die Politik der Weisheit.*

(8) In these passages each member must be completed by the other.

(9) The prosperity of the age of Solomon is reflected in the peace and quiet shed over the life of the wise.

(10) This conclusion must be arrived at even according to the most favorable explanation of the passages discussed.

FOURTH SECTION.

THE ENIGMAS OF HUMAN LIFE. THE STRUGGLE FOR THEIR SOLUTION (1).

§ 245.

The Enigmas themselves.

That which above all else gave rise to the struggle between faith and doubt, was the perception that the actual course of events did not harmonize with the *postulates of the doctrine of retribution*,—that the God who judges righteously did not make His righteous judgment evident in what befell either nations or individuals. The Israelitish mind was the less able to turn to fatalistic consolations, because in its view the reality of the idea of God coincided with the reality of the ordinance of retribution, and the denial of the latter would result in atheism. It was indeed the very characteristic of the wicked, that while he said in his pride, "God will not requite it," he really meant, "There is no God;" comp. passages such as Ps. x. 4 sq., xiv. 1. It is on this account that Job is so often reproached by his friends for resembling the wicked (רְשָׁעִים) by disputing the Divine retribution. If on this account those who suffer are first of all required to seek for the reason of their sufferings in their sins, Lam. iii. 39 sq. (2), the tuition of the law, on the other hand, not only arouses an accusing, but produces a good conscience, which the man who walks in God's ways, and is therefore unable to acknowledge that his suffering is the punishment of his sin, is conscious that he may venture to assert; comp. Ps. xvii. 1 sqq., xviii. 21 sqq., Job xxxi., and other passages. Even in the theocratic covenant, God approaches man as a free being, as one who has not only obligations, but rights. Hence no self-condemnation, contrary to his own conscience, is demanded. When Job declines such self-condemnation as was pressed upon him, when he says, *e.g.*, xxvii. 5 sq., "I will not let my integrity be taken

from me ; my righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go ; my heart does not reproach one of my days," his words testify that his conviction of sin was not as yet as deep as it should be. But still his very sincerity in not having recourse to falsehood *in majorem Dei gloriam* is expressly approved, xlii. 7. Severely as the Old Testament rebukes murmuring *unbelief*, and little as it concedes to man, regarded in his natural worthlessness, any claim upon God (3), it still furnishes, within the institution of the covenant, ground upon which suffering innocence and piety may, when the wicked prosper, venture to expostulate with God, such expostulation being indeed the result of faith in the covenant God and in the truth of His promises. Accordingly, in times of conflict and distress, we find in the Old Testament the language of *expostulation* with the just God in the mouth of His servants, and so often meet with that frequently recurring *why?* "Why standest Thou afar off, O Lord? why hidest Thou Thyself in times of trouble?" Ps. x. 1. "Why does the wicked contemn God? ver. 13. "How long wilt Thou look on?" xxxv. 17. Comp. also the complaint of the influence of the wicked in the Psalms in general, Ps. xii., xiv., and others. Similar complaints of the supremacy of evil and the delay of Divine retribution are found also in the prophets, comp. Hab. i., Jer. xii. 15, 18, etc. But while the perplexities caused by the fortunes of nations were solved for the prophets by the view afforded them of the consummation of the Divine kingdom, of the day of the Lord when judgment and deliverance should manifest the Divine righteousness, it was concerning the enigmas of individual life, presented by the prosperity of the wicked and the calamities of the godly, that the reflecting mind of the Old Testament sages struggled to obtain light. Several of the Psalms dwell on this matter, which is the special subject of the whole Book of Job. The consideration, however, of the contradiction so often existing between the moral worth of a man and his lot in life, leads at once to the discovery of another enigma. If there were a retribution after death, a solution of the contradiction in which the lot of man often appears to stand to the justice of God might be expected in *another world*. But as we have seen in Part I., are not all alike in death and in the regions of the dead? And then, further, how does the sad doom of Sheol agree with the Divine destination of man? (4). Suppose even that a just man were to prosper during his whole life, what would this profit him, when he descends to the realm of shades? The lamentation over the perishableness of man, over death and the grave, found in many of the Psalms, and in chh. vii. and xiv. of the Book of Job, has quite a different meaning from that met with in heathen writers, because the Old Testament did not view the mortality of man as a natural necessity, but connected it with sin and the wrath of God, Ps. xc. 7–9 (see Pt. I. § 77), and because the communion instituted by revelation between the living God and man imparts to human personality an eternal importance. This, indeed, at first manifests itself only in the assurance of the continued duration of the chosen race, but, in proportion as the personal experience of communion with God deepens, it awakens in the individual also, the feeling of an imperishable destiny. Hence, in place of that satisfaction with which we see the patriarchs depart from a life filled with God's goodness, and gathered to their fathers in the joyful prospect of the blessings promised to their descendants, in place of the praise of that grace of God which had bestowed so large a share of its gifts during the fleeting life of man, Ps. ciii. 15–18, we find in hours of

temptation, dismay at the fact that communion with God (the seeing of the Lord, Isa. xxxviii. 11) must cease in death. Nay, it seems incomprehensible that God, who desires to be loved and praised by His people, should Himself dissolve the tie which He has made with man; comp. Ps. xxx. 9, lxxxviii. 12 sq., and other passages (5). This fear of death among the Old Testament saints is an infinitely more exalted feeling than the contempt of death found among the heathen; for death, as Luther says in his exposition of Ps. xc., is not to be conquered by contempt, as serfs and rogues suppose.

(1) Comp. my article, "Immortality, Doctrine of the Old Testament on," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xxi. p. 419 sqq. [Also some good remarks in Bestmann, *Gesch. d. chr. Sitte*, i. 332.]

(2) Lam. iii. 39 sq.: "Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins? Let us search and try our ways, and turn again unto the Lord."

(3) For how should the clay strive with the potter, a potsherd among potsherds! Isa. xxix. 16, xlv. 9–11, and elsewhere.

(4) That the ancient doctrine of Sheol is found also in the Psalms and in the writings of the Hhokhma, has been shown, § 78 sq.

(5) Ps. xxx. 9: "What profit is there in my blood, when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise Thee? or shall it declare Thy truth?" *Ib.* lxxxviii. 11 sq.: "Shall Thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or Thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall Thy wonders be known in the dark? and Thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Comp. vi. 6.

§ 246.

The Struggle to solve the Enigmas relating to this Subject in the Psalms.

In those *Psalms* which relate to the *contradiction existing between the moral worth of an individual and his external circumstances*, we generally find that the knot is not untied, but simply cut. The righteous man who seems about to perish must nevertheless be delivered, or Jehovah would not be Jehovah; therefore "for His name's sake" the wicked who think themselves so secure must perish, as surely as a righteous God exists. When prevailing with God in prayer, the Psalmist surmounts every hindrance which opposes the realization of his confidence; comp. the supplicatory Psalms iii., iv., v., vii., ix., and a whole series of similar ones. Another special feature is to be remarked in those Psalms in which that judgment upon his enemies which the Psalmist confidently entreats is also in a measure announced—the so-called *imprecatory Psalms*, of which Ps. lix., lxix., and cix. are the strongest. Instead of being shocked at them, we need simply to understand them. And it is easy to perceive that what we find in them is no private feeling of anger venting itself in curses, but that they are the product of zeal for the honor of that God who is attacked in His servants; comp. especially lxix. 10 (1). Such Psalms are just the expression of the sentiment, cxxxix. 21 sq.: "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee? and am not I grieved with them that rise up against Thee? I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies." The fact, however, that there is, in the manner and degree in which the assumption of Divine retribution upon the wicked is expressed, a severity which casts the love that would seek and save the lost into the background, must certainly

be in general explained by the difference between the standpoint of the law and of the gospel,—a difference pointed out by our Lord to His disciples when rebuking them for manifesting the zeal of Elijah, Luke ix. 55. But another and often-overlooked point must be here considered. The New Testament itself knows of no other final reconciliation of the contradiction introduced into the world by the existence of evil than that which is accomplished by judgment. But the difference between the two Testaments lies in the circumstance that the Old Testament, referring, as far as retribution is concerned, exclusively to this life, does not afford the same scope for the Divine long-suffering as the New, and must demand an actual and adequate sentence, an infliction of judgment upon the ungodly within the limits of this earthly existence. What, now, if the very postulate of faith seems again and again falsified by experience,—if, as Ps. lxxiii. 13 says, to cleanse the heart and life seems to be in vain, while the prosperity of audacious transgressors appears secure? The solution furnished by certain Psalms is not a dogmatic one, *i.e.* no doctrine actually leading beyond the limits of Mosaism is arrived at. It is rather a solution which is *subjective and personal.* The communion with God to which the Psalmist has been admitted asserts itself with such strength, that he not only finds therein his full compensation for the prosperity of the wicked, but, rising for the moment superior to death and Sheol, knows himself to be inseparably united to God. The transition to such passages is formed by Ps. iv. 8, where David, in such hopeless circumstances as made many of his followers despair, esteems the joy which he has in God beyond the superfluity in which his enemies revel. But the first chief passage in which the feeling of saving and indissoluble union with God is poured forth is Ps. xvi. Because the Lord is his supreme good, and always with him, the Psalmist is also able to say, ver. 10 sq.: "Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol, nor suffer Thy holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life. In Thy presence is fulness of joy; and at Thy right hand pleasures for evermore." It would (as even Hupfeld frankly admits) empty these words of their meaning to see in them only a confidence of deliverance from mortal peril. To this feeling, however, we must certainly refer such passages as xlviii. 14 and lxviii. 20, which some (*e.g.* Stier) have also interpreted of deliverance from death in the New Testament sense (2). The case of Ps. xvi. is rather as follows: The idea that the righteous must at last succumb to death and Sheol, and that their happiness in God is to be thereby terminated, is at such moments an impossible one to the Psalmist. Hence he gives utterance to a presentiment which reaches beyond the limits of the ancient covenant. The words, "I shall behold Thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness," xvii. 15, if they refer, according to the view still defended by many moderns (De Wette, Delitzsch), to an awaking from the sleep of death, whether to a heavenly life or to resurrection, would go still further. But the meaning of the passage is (3) only that the Psalmist is magnifying that higher happiness which he, as a godly man, enjoys in beholding God, and on which is founded his assurance that his prayer will be heard, in comparison with that contemptuously described prosperity with which God fills the ungodly (4). The *beholding* God's face and being satisfied with His likeness do not go beyond the expressions used lxiii. 3, and are simply the strongest terms for denoting the consciousness of God's gracious

presence. The passage is akin to Ps. iv. 8 sq. ; and a comparison with the latter leads to the supposition that Ps. xvii. may be an evening or night prayer, and that the awaking in ver. 15 may refer to awaking from natural sleep. But even if the passage does not treat of a happy life after death, it is still, as Hupfeld justly remarks, an important one, on account of its wonderfully profound conception of the world, and of life in the world as a vain and empty possession, as contrasted with the life of the soul in God. Ps. xlix. 15 and lxxiii. 23 sqq. (5), however, go still further. When the Psalmist says in the former passage, "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for He shall receive me" (6), we may indeed, if we disregard the connection, understand him to speak only of deliverance from danger. But it must be observed that these words are spoken in opposition to ver. 8 sqq., according to which no man is capable of redeeming the soul of his neighbor from Sheol, while the Psalmist looks for redemption from God ; and to ver. 14, which consigns the man of the world to the desolation of the grave (7). Besides, the allusion of יִקָּחֵנִי to the passage concerning Enoch, Gen. v. 24, כִּי־לָקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים, is unmistakable. Thus the Psalmist is evidently expressing the hope that there will be for him a rising from the region of the dead to a higher life. To return to Ps. lxxiii., it may be disputed whether the words, "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory," ver. 24, have regard to a fulfilment in this or in another world. But in any case, ver. 26, "When my flesh and my heart fail, God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever," expresses the confidence of the Psalmist that even if his heart fails in death, his communion with God cannot be dissolved (8). Still, even in these passages we have (as Delitzsch well observes) no direct word from God for this hope to lean on ; they do but express the postulate of faith, that for the just, existence must issue in glory and in the permanent possession of communion with God. How this is to be realized cannot, however, be shown. Hence the triumph of faith over death and the grave is accompanied by the complaint, so strongly and incisively expressed in Ps. lxxxviii. that the seals of death and Sheol remain as yet unbroken (9). Let us now see what answer is furnished to the enigmas of life by the Book of Job.

(1) Ps. lxix. 9 : "The zeal of Thine house hath eaten me up, and the reproaches of them that reproached Thee are fallen upon me."

(2) In saying which, we leave it undecided whether in Ps. xlviii. 14 the explanation, "He will be our guide at (or to) death," rests upon the more correct reading of the text.

(3) Still we are not justified in completing the thought (as Delitzsch does) : "If I should go to rest in the present peril of death." The urgent supplication, ver. 13, that God would arise to help the suppliant against his ungodly foes, is not recalled.

(4) Ver. 14, as, following Hengstenberg, I have explained it in the *Commentationes ad theol. bibl.*, does not contain an argument for the supplication in ver. 13, as though the Psalmist were complaining to God of the contradiction between the prosperity and deserts of the wicked.

(5) Comp. Klostermann, *Untersuchungen zur alttest. Theol.* 1868.

(6) יִקָּחֵנִי refers to God, not to שְׁאוֹל, which is feminine (§ 78).

(7) It it quite arbitrary to supplement ver. 15 with : So far as not to suffer it to go down to the grave prematurely or by violence (so Hengstenberg, in the last essay in his commentary on the Psalms).

(8) The thought is arbitrarily deprived of its meaning by Hengstenberg, when he supplies after ver. 26*a*: Through God's mercy it will not, however, come to this.

(9) To the question, Does the announcement of the resurrection of the dead made by the prophets find an echo in the Psalms? I feel obliged to return a negative answer. It is no longer disputed that xc. 3, "Return, ye children of men," does not refer to it; nor am I able to adduce in support of it cxli. 7, "Our bones are scattered at the grave's mouth, as when one ploweth and divideth the earth." Even if the image of ploughing and scattering seed is explained by the object to which both contribute, still the connection leads only to the thought that the persecution and ill-usage endured must result in the triumph of the Psalmist's cause. Much rather might Ps. xxii. 29 be brought forward. יוֹרְדֵי עָפָר, considered in itself, may well be regarded as designating the dead; and the more so that the connection of the feast described ver. 26 with that at which death is to be swallowed up in victory, Isa. xxv. 6–8, is sufficiently probable (comp. § 233). But then the expression חַיָּיִם would be no fitting contrast; and we should have expected "all the living" or some such expression. On the relation of the Psalms to the last things, compare Delitzsch's *Commentary*, i. p. 75 sqq.

§ 247.

Solution of the Enigmas in the Book of Job (1).

All the enigmas with which Israelitish wisdom was occupied are discussed in the Book of Job, and every solution produced upon Old Testament soil is attempted. This book, however, does not, as it has so often been understood to do from a partial and theoretical view, carry on the investigation in the form of a learned debate. On the contrary, a fragment of Old Testament life is at once brought before us, and it is shown, by Job's example, how a righteous man may fall into such grievous temptation as to threaten his trust in God with shipwreck, and how the struggles of faith at last result in victory. This book has often been contrasted with Mosaism, as coming to a formal rupture with the doctrine of retribution. This is, however, far from being the case,—the Mosaic doctrine of retribution being, on the contrary, expressly confirmed by the issue, viz. the abundant compensation of the hero of the book for his sufferings. The fact, however, that *various* Divine purposes are shown to be the reason of human suffering, points out the insufficiency of the opinion that every infliction is to be referred to a corresponding sin, and manifests the right of every responsible being not to be judged absolutely according to outward appearances. It also inculcates the duty of abstaining from hasty decisions concerning obscure providences, and waiting with humility to see their end. This book teaches us to recognize *a fourfold purpose in human suffering*. 1. There is a *penal suffering* with which God visits the ungodly. This proposition is discussed in manifold aspects by the *three friends of Job* (see especially ch. viii., xv. 20–35, ch. xviii. and xx.), and at last conceded by Job himself (xxvii. 11 sqq.), after again maintaining (ch. xxi.) the impunity of transgressors in this world, and admitting in ch. xxiv. the occurrence of penal retribution only with respect to ordinary offenders, but denying the rule of God's penal justice in the case of great criminals (2). 2. There is a *Divine chastisement* imposed upon all men, which is necessarily due to the natural impurity and sinfulness of human nature, and

must accordingly be borne by the righteous also. The latter submit patiently to the infliction of such chastisement, and may therefore experience a restoration of their prosperity. This is the doctrine which Eliphaz advances in his first speech, in explanation of the calamities of Job, ch. iv. sq., where, iv. 12–16, he refers to a revelation imparted to him in a night vision. 3. There is also a special *testing and purifying* of the righteous imposed upon them by the love of God, for the purpose of delivering them from some secret pride, of leading them to humble and penitent self-knowledge, and of thus insuring to them the Divine favor. This is the doctrine which Elihu brings forward in xxxiii. 14–29, xxxvi. 5–15. It is closely connected with the solution furnished in ch. iv. by Eliphaz, but yet differs from it, inasmuch as the point of view which the latter insists upon is a judicial one, viz. that of a penal discipline which must fall upon the evil and the just alike, on account of their inherent sinfulness, and quite irrespective of special sins, and which has in the case of both a different result only by reason of their different behavior under Divine chastisement. The suffering of which Elihu speaks, on the contrary, concerns only the righteous, and is a proof of the saving love of God, to purify them from that pride of the inner man which threatens them with danger (3). And, finally, 4. There is a suffering which is designed to *manifest the triumph of faith* and the fidelity of the righteous. This it is which was the immediate object of Job's afflictions, as already alluded to in the *prologue* (ch. i. sq.), and evidenced to all in the *epilogue*. Proof is furnished in the case of Job, in opposition to those suspicions on the part of Satan, of which his three friends also rendered themselves guilty by the increasing temper with which they spoke, that the faith of even a true servant of God may be sorely shaken, nay, that he may be brought to the very verge of despair, by the temptation of suffering; that nevertheless he cannot, even in the midst of rebellion against God, entirely give Him up; and, finally, that his fidelity stands the test, though he does not come through the trial without abundant cause for humiliation. Such sufferings are akin to those endured as *testimony*, to sufferings entailed by confession of the truth, and zeal for the house of God, as spoken of in many of the psalms (*e.g.* Ps. xxii., § 233), and by Jeremiah.

But while the Book of Job thus offers a key to these afflictions of the righteous, it at the same time furnishes reasons for believing in the *righteous providence of God*, from the consideration of His character and His dominion over nature. From *the character of God*—in the profound speech of Elihu, ch. xxxiv. 10 sqq., the fundamental thought of which is: God, by reason of His *power* over the world, can never be unjust. For the world is not a thing alien to Him, a thing intrusted to Him by another, but His own possession, and all life therein is derived from His breath. God cannot be unjust to that which He Himself called into existence, and maintains therein. It is because He is the Creator and Governor of the world that He is also the only source of right therein. He so directs the lot of individuals and nations, that right is at last made manifest. This oneness of power and righteousness in God is also brought forward in the second address of the Lord to Job, ch. xl., and the subject applied to man, to show that, if his righteousness is to be vindicated at the expense of the Divine righteousness, he ought also to be possessed of Divine power. But Divine providence also may be inferred from God's *dominion over nature*. This proposition is already prepared for in ch. xxviii., the

idea being there carried out that man, though incapable of becoming possessed of the Divine wisdom itself—of the thought according to which the world is ordered—is yet able to recognize its traces in the whole economy of nature, and may therefore, with regard to the Divine appointment of human life, resign himself to, and fall back on, the fear of God. This point of view is, however, especially maintained by Elihu. God approaches man in nature as an incomparable teacher (מִי כָּמֹהוּ מוֹרֶה, xxxvi. 22), everywhere manifesting to him His wisdom and power. And if, on the other hand, the course of nature brings before him so many paradoxes, so much that is incomprehensible, this furnishes him with a standard whereby to judge that which is incomprehensible in human life, as expressed in the fine passage xxxvii. 21 sqq.(4). The meaning of this passage is: As, when the light of the sun is hidden from the sight of man by a cloud, the sun is nevertheless shining in the atmosphere, and presently again unveils itself to the eye, so God, though His interposition is often concealed from us, is surrounded by pure light; and as the dark north bears gold in its bosom, so also is there pure light behind the obscurity of God's dispensations. Thus Elihu shows that man is not obliged to resign himself to such a conclusion as Job had done in ch. xxviii., but may, from perceiving that there is a purpose in the Divine dealings, at least attain to so much knowledge, that instead of arrogantly censuring providence, he may confidently look for a solution of its enigmas.

(1) From internal evidence, it is probable that the Book of Job must not be referred, as by many [*e.g.* Delitzsch in the art. "Hiob" in the 2d ed. of Herzog], to the times of Solomon, but to one of the subsequent centuries of Israel's adversity and affliction. We see from Jeremiah and Ezekiel that it was just in such troublous national times that men's minds were exercised by the doctrine of retribution. And though it was only the inconsiderate among the people who so misapplied the saying of the law, that God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children, as to represent themselves as suffering present evils without their own fault (an error reproved Jer. xxxi. 29 sq., Ezek. xviii., comp. § 75), still we see from Jer. xii. 1 sqq. how sorely even the faith of a prophet was tried. [Jeremiah's acquaintance with the book is pretty generally recognized by the modern critics. Hitzig and Reuss place its composition at the end of the eighth century, Strack (in Zöckler, i. p. 157 f.) about the year 700, Dillmann and G. Baur in the first half of the seventh century.] For a survey of the train of thought in this book, see the Programme cited, p. 19 sqq. Compare also my review of Hahn's and Schlottmann's *Commentaries on the Book of Job* in *Reuter's Repertorium*, 1852 [also Green, *The Argument of the Book of Job unfolded*, 1874, and Conant's Introduction to his *Translation of Job*, 1857.—D.]

(2) Stickel (*Das Buch Hiob*, etc., 1842, p. 186 sqq.) was the first to point out the correct meaning of this difficult section.

(3) Hence, but for *the speeches of Elihu*, an essential aspect of the Divine purpose in sending affliction would not have been treated of at all in this book,—a circumstance which might indeed have given a subsequent writer occasion for interpolating this portion. Nor must it be by any means overlooked, that without these speeches there would be no due acknowledgment that the three friends of Job were so far in the right when they asserted that affliction *always* has a reference to the sinfulness of man. In the place which these addresses now occupy in the book, they serve also to prepare for that humble submission of Job which was to be brought about by the appearance of the Almighty. See the conclusion of the section. [Dillmann and Delitzsch both maintain that the speeches of Elihu are a subsequent addition to the book. But see Conant, *ib.* vi.–x.—D.]

(4) Job xxxvii. 21 sqq. (a storm is supposed to be approaching): "Now we see

not the sunshine which nevertheless glitters in the cloud; there the wind passeth over it, and cleanseth it. From the north cometh gold: the glory around God is terrible. We find not the Almighty, who is excellent in power, in judgment and in fulness of justice—He bendeth it not. Therefore men fear Him: He respecteth not the wise of heart."

§ 248.

Continuation.

The question which still remains to be discussed is, What position does the Book of Job, which keeps the attention directed to the state of man after death, beyond any book of the Old Testament, occupy with regard to the *doctrine of immortality?* The notion that its direct purpose is to prove the doctrine of the immortality of the human soul, rests upon a misconception. It is, however, true that in it are deposited the presuppositions of the hope of eternal life. For it brings forward, in passages already mentioned, the painful contradiction existing between man's destiny to communion with God and that descent to Sheol which awaits him, and at the same time testifies that the mind, in its struggle with this contradiction, cannot avoid attaining to a glimpse of its solution. A remarkable progress is in this respect manifested in this book. For though in vii. 7 sqq., x. 20–22, the lamentations over the transitoriness of man and the abode in Sheol, the region of night, whence there is no return, sound quite hopeless, the hope is already expressed, in ch. xiv., that the sojourn in Sheol may be but a transient one, and that the time may come when God, having a desire toward the work of His hands, shall turn again to man. It is said, ver. 14, "If a man die, shall he live? All the days of my campaign, would I wait, till my discharge came;" and, ver. 15, "Thou wouldest call, and I would answer Thee: Thou wouldst have a desire to the work of Thy hands." And the anticipation prepared for by xvi. 18 sqq. reaches its climax in the passage xix. 25–27, "I know that my redeemer lives," etc., where Job, no longer expecting a justification of his innocence during the short respite still allotted him, expresses, on the other hand, his confidence that God will arise even over his grave as his Goel, his avenger of blood, to retrieve his honor before the world, by inflicting judgments upon those who had suspected him, and that he shall behold this Divine interposition. [There is no ground to regard the *goel* here as a blood-avenger; he is rather regarded as a *vindicator* or defender. Dr. Conant has correctly rendered the passage: "But I, I know my redeemer (vindicator) lives, and in after time will stand upon the earth: and after this my skin is destroyed, and without my flesh, shall I see God, whom I, for myself, shall see, and mine eyes behold, and not another:" or better, "whom I, even I, shall see on my side, and mine eyes shall behold, and not him as a stranger."—D.] Notwithstanding the multitude of erroneous explanations which have been offered, the only view which can be accepted as doing justice to the words, is that which regards the passage as expressing the hope of a manifestation of God to be made in Job's favor after his death. It may perhaps be disputed whether Job's beholding God as his Redeemer (Goel) is to take place in another world. For certainly the view, advocated especially by H. Schultz (1), that Job was only transposing himself to the period after his death,—that he was now seeing with

the eye of the mind how God would then appear as his witness and procure his acquittal,—must not be regarded as absolutely impossible. The imperfect אֶחֱזֶה is, however, utterly unfavorable to this explanation (2). Still the passage, even according to the explanation which we have adopted, speaks only of a momentary beholding, which, however, presupposes a continuance of Job's communion with God after death. But the hope which here flashes for a moment like lightning through the darkness of temptation, is as yet no mature faith in a happy and eternal life after death, and consequently does not furnish a solution to the enigmas with which the book is occupied. This presentiment of Job appears only as a last resort, if the solution should remain undiscovered in this world. In the course of the poem, it is evident that this glimpse of hope on the part of Job has the effect of enabling him to maintain greater composure ; but in the end the solution is brought to pass in a manner which confirms the Old Testament doctrine of retribution, and keeps the book within Old Testament limits. That final solution of all enigmas, that the sufferings of this present world are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in the children of God, was not discovered by Job, nor by the Old Testament in general. By reason of the constant connection existing between revealed knowledge and the facts of revelation, a belief in eternal life which should be truly stable could not arise until the acquisition of eternal life, as faith in Him who in His own person overcame death and brought life and immortality to light, and who through His redeeming work has perfected also the saints of the Old Testament, Heb. xi. 40.

(1) See H. Schultz, *Die Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit*, p. 222, and *Alttest. Theol.* ii. p. 661 sqq.
(2) See Dillmann on the passage, and Orelli, p. 207 sq.

FIFTH SECTION.

RENUNCIATION OF THE SOLUTION IN THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES (1).

§ 249.

Standpoint of this Book. Inquiry concerning Divine Retribution and Immortality.

The Book of *Koheleth* or *Ecclesiastes*, whose composition is probably to be referred to the second half of the fifth (comp. § 191), or at latest to the fourth century B.C., forms the conclusion of the canonical Old Testament Hhokhma. Its standpoint may be briefly designated as that of *resignation—an abandonment of the attempt to comprehend the Divine government of the world*, the reality of which to *faith*, it, however, firmly holds. The proposition with which the book opens, "Vanity of vanities ; . . . all is vanity," is not to be taken in an objective sense, as though the world were but the region of chance, which the author expressly denies, but in the *subjective* meaning that for man, notwithstanding all his efforts after knowledge, and all his activity, the course of this world yields nothing real or permanent ; on which account it is immediately added, i. 3, "What profit (מַה־יִּתְרוֹן) hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun?" The latter sen-

tence is not intended to state a problem which is about to be solved in the book,—the question as to what is the supreme good being thus regarded as the theme of the work,—for the author has done with the notion that any יִתְרוֹן, any result, is to be expected. The words are rather an exclamation in a negative sense, expressing the fruitlessness of all human efforts. This is accordingly proved, the author speaking in the person of the ancient king Solomon, the wise and glorious monarch, who had enjoyed in rich abundance all that this world can offer, had obtained whatever man can obtain, and now at the close of his life testified that in all this he had found no real satisfaction, no true happiness. Even the wisdom of which he possessed a larger measure than other mortals, had only the effect of convincing him that real good is not to be found by man in aught earthly. This negation, however, of all finite objects does not advance to the perception of a positive and eternal object. On the contrary, absolute good being hidden from man, nothing is left for him but to accept with resignation the relative good which consists in using this fleeting life as well as possible, by being obedient to the Divine commands and mindful of the approaching Divine judgment, while at the same time committing all to God (2). This book is equally misunderstood when its author is credited with a knowledge beyond the limits of the Old Testament, and especially with the knowledge of eternal life, etc., and when he is regarded as a fatalist or an Epicurean. So little does this book preach infidelity, that its author does not surrender even one of the doctrines transmitted to him. *That* there is a Divine government of the world, *that* there is a righteous retribution, faith may not question : it is the *how* of these matters that man is unable to comprehend. God, it is said, iii. 11, hath made everything beautiful in its time ; He hath also set eternity in the heart of man. For we are not justified in giving here to עוֹלָם another than its usual meaning, which it retains also in ver. 14. The expression refers back to the reflections, ii. 12 sqq. (3). Man, the author would say, cannot cease to seek that which is eternal and imperishable ; "but man cannot find out the work that God doeth from beginning to end," *i.e.* is never able to understand the result produced by the God-ordained course of the world (4). This appears especially in respect to *Divine retribution*. Experience is seen by the author to be always at variance with the adoption of this doctrine. If the Book of Proverbs categorically lays down (as we have seen, § 243) the proposition, "Wisdom brings life ; folly, death ; the memory of the just is blessed ; but the name of the wicked shall rot," Ecclesiastes points out, ii. 13, that "wisdom excelleth folly, inasmuch as the wise man's eyes are in his head ; but the fool walketh in darkness. But one event happeneth to all : as it happeneth to the fool, so it happeneth even to me. There is no more remembrance for ever of the wise man than of the fool ; seeing that which now is, in the days to come shall all be forgotten, and how the wise man dieth as the fool." To this is added the sad experience of the impunity of the wicked. Still all this must not destroy the postulate of faith, viii. 12 sq. : "Though the sinner do evil a hundred times, and his days be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God, that fear before Him. But it shall not be well with the wicked, neither shall he prolong his days," etc. ; comp. also the similar passage, iii. 16 sq.

When this contrast between *faith*, which confidently assumes the existence of a solution to the contradictions found in the world, and *natural knowledge*, which

proves itself insufficient in all cases, and cannot furnish a solution to any of the enigmas,—when this contrast, which pervades the whole book, is considered, the discrepancies supposed to exist therein disappear, and the attempt to reconcile them, by forcibly adapting one passage to another, may be given up, and its due weight and meaning allowed to each. It is from this point of view that the question whether Ecclesiastes teaches the *immortality* of man must be answered. Various answers may be given, because three different points of view are taken in the book with respect to it (4),—that, 1*st*, of *natural reflection;* 2*d*, of *the old doctrine of Sheol;* 3*d*, of *the assumption of a future retribution*. From the standpoint of natural observation, *e.g.*, it is said, iii. 19, that the fate of man and the animals appears to be the same in death; for "who knows," it is asked, ver. 21, "whether the spirit of man goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" That natural observation can give man no information in this respect, should serve to humble him, ver. 18. God would prove them, that they may see that in themselves (*i.e.* apart from their relation to God) they are beasts. The old doctrine of Sheol is (6), on the other hand, expressed in ix. 4–6, 10,—passages which have been already discussed, Pt. I. § 78 sq. The third standpoint is asserted at the close, where the author, dismissing all the doubts resulting from natural observation, positively expresses, xii. 7, the tenet that the spirit of man returns to God who gave it; and, xii. 14, comp. xi. 9, that God will bring every secret thing to judgment, whether it be good or whether it be evil. How the author conceived of the relation between the spirit that returns to God and the shade that departs to the region of the dead, cannot indeed be determined. Neither can the controversy, in what sense he teaches a future judgment, be decided. It is not probable that he transferred it to some earthly events to be developed in this life, the expression "every secret thing" seeming opposed to such a notion; but nothing certain can be stated on this subject.

(1) See the Introduction to Delitzsch's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*.

(2) But herein consists the advance made in this book beyond the Book of Job, which at its close falls back upon the Old Testament standpoint.

(3) In Eccles. ii. 12 sqq., what is spoken of is, that the satisfaction which man obtains from his efforts and labor is destroyed as soon as he reflects that he thereby obtains no permanent result to outlast his transitory existence.

(4) Many expositors, on the other hand, give to עוֹלָם the later signification *world*, which it had not yet acquired in the Old Testament, and which affords no good contrast.

(5) Entirely opposite views have been taken in this respect, the Preacher being said by some entirely to deny existence after death, and by others to teach the immortality of the soul and a future judgment.

(6) It might seem most natural to think of a judgment following the abode in Sheol, where, according to ix. 5, there is no reward. But however the passage may be understood, positive testimony of the life eternal is not found in this book. Comp. also my *Comment. Bibl. Theol.* p. 83 sqq.

§ 250.

Moral Teaching of the Book. Conclusion.

The *moral teaching* imparted in this book corresponds with the standpoint of resignation which it occupies. If an inexorable demand is made that man submit to the Divine will, and if at the same time the supreme aim of life according to that will, cannot be ascertained by him, while on the other hand, various aims are set before him, all of which he cannot but regard as in their measure lawful, his moral life must be spent in a constant balancing between different and intersecting claims. Hence prudence, moderation in all things, the μηδὲν ἄγαν, is the quality to be most urgently recommended. The pride which boasts of virtue is reproved, as well as the pride of knowledge. To this refers the injunction, vii. 16, "Be not righteous over-much, neither make thyself over-wise," which is followed, ver. 17, by, "Be not over-much wicked, neither be thou foolish," the meaning of which is: Do not think thou canst be free from sin (see ver. 20); but that thine inclination to sin may not get the better of thee, thou must moderate it. Ver. 18: "It is good that thou shouldest take hold of the one, and also not withdraw thy hand from the other; for he that *feareth God* shall come forth from them all." Thus the happy medium lies between a self-righteousness over-zealous for virtue and a sinful levity of life; and this happy medium is inculcated by the fear of God, with which (comp. iii. 12 sq.) is combined also a reasonable measure of the enjoyments of this life; for it is said, iii. 13, "That every man should eat and drink, and enjoy the good of all his labor, is the gift of God." But the gladness which imparts vigor to the inner life is not found in the Preacher. Placed in the midst of vicissitudes ordained of God (ver. 1 sqq.), he takes patiently whatever comes as from Him, vii. 14: "In the day of prosperity be joyful, and in the day of adversity consider: God hath made the one as well as the other, that man may find nothing after him." *i.e.* may not fathom what lies behind his present condition. In such patient composure the wise man does at all times just that which is seasonable, and commits the issue to God. Thus are to be explained the sayings, xi. 4 sqq.: "He that observeth the wind shall not sow, and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap;" *i.e.*, he for whom the weather is never fine enough, and who is therefore always waiting for better, generally misses the right time; ver. 6: "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand; for thou knowest not which shall prosper, whether this or that, or whether both shall be alike good;" *i.e.*, be always assiduous in thy calling: fulfil each hour that which is incumbent on thee, without care as to the result; for thou knowest not whether the labor of this or of that hour shall prosper. The frame of mind possessed by the wise man in the midst of all this composure is shown vii. 2–4: "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting, for that (to be mourned) is the end of all men; and let the living lay it to heart. Sorrow is better than laughter; for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better. The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning; but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth." Ecclesiastes may be called a book of worldly sadness,—not the sadness of one utterly sick of life, but of one who, though weary, does not suffer the stimulus of eternity to be plucked

out of his heart, and who has rescued his fear of God out of the ruins of his earthly hopes and schemes. Hence at its close, xi. 9 sqq., the Preacher exhorts the young man to enjoy the pleasures of youth, which vanishes like the dawn, because when old age with its infirmity sets in, no more pleasure can be attained in this life; but while rejoicing in youth, to remember the Creator from whom all good things come, and never to surrender the certainty "that for all these things God will bring him into judgment." The dialectics of the Book of Ecclesiastes, with their mainly negative result, also form a transition *from the Old to the New Testament*. For from a persuasion of the vanity of all earthly good, arises the longing after the eternal and saving blessings of the New Testament, and the desire for the coming of that immutable kingdom of God announced by prophecy, in which the inquiries of Old Testament and all other wisdom have found their enduring object (1).

(1) It lies beyond the limits of the task we have imposed upon ourselves (see § 4) to show how Hebrew wisdom, after exhausting itself in the way hitherto described, sought to satisfy its struggles after knowledge by combining Hellenic with Oriental elements (comp. the article "Pädagogik des A. T." in Schmid, v. p. 692 sqq., and "Buch der Weisheit und judischer Hellenismus," x. p. 298 sqq. For particulars respecting the view of the state after death in the Apocrypha, see the article "Unsterblichkeit Lehre des A. T." in Herzog, xxi. p. 424 sqq., and comp. H. Schultz, *Die Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit*, p. 239 sqq.). [Delitzsch says, in the Introduction to his Commentary: "The Book of Ecclesiastes is on the one hand an argument for the power of the religion of revelation, which has rooted faith in one God, the all-wise and righteous ruler of the world, so deeply and firmly in the religious consciousness, that the most discordant and confusing impressions of the present world are unable to shake it; and on the other hand, an argument for the insufficiency of the religion of revelation in its Old Testament form, since the dissatisfaction and pain occasioned by the monotony, distraction, and misery of earth remained so long without any counterbalancing good until heaven above the earth was disclosed and unveiled in the historical facts of redemption. In no Old Testament book does the old Covenant appear, as in the Book of Ecclesiastes, as a *παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ* (Heb. viii. 13). If the darkness is to be dissipated, a new Covenant must be established, by the entrance of celestial love, which is at the same time celestial wisdom, into the world, its victory over sin, death and hades, and the transfer of the centre of human existence to the life beyond the grave. To this new time the finger of prophecy points. And Ecclesiastes, upon its heap of rubbish, shows how needful it is that heaven should now open above the earth."]

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Aaron, race of, 201, 209.
Abel, 54.
Abiathar, 375.
Abijah, 403.
Abimelech, 361.
Abram, Abraham, 60-64, 166, 181, 229.
Achan, 81, 82.
Achelis, 109.
Achor, Valley of, 82.
Adhonai, 92.
Adonis, 102.
Adrammelech, 413.
Adultery, 230 seq., 553.
After-Passover, 325.
Ages of the world, 118.
Ahab, King, 390 seq. ; the false prophet, 420.
Ahasuerus, 427.
Ahaz, 408 seq.
Ahaziah, of Israel, 391 ; of Judah, 404.
Ahijah, 384, 388.
Alexandrian theology, 23.
Almond blossoms, 257.
Altar, 255.
Amaziah, 405.
Ammonites, 180, 516.
Amon, 412.
Amorites, 76.
Amos, 388, 395 seq., 407, 464, 476, 502, 526.
Analogia fidei, 25.
Angel of the Lord, 129, 131 seq.
Angelology, Mosaic, 134 seq. ; prophetic, 441, seq.
Angels, names of, 446 seq.
Anammelech, 413.
Anointing of the high priest, 215 ; of kings, 368 ; of prophets, 392.
Anthropology of Mosaism, 145.
Anthropomorphisms, 99, 111.
Anthropopathies, 115.
Apis worship, 68.
Apocalypse, Jewish, 434.
Apocrypha, 10, 13.
Archaeology, biblical, 7 seq.
Ark of the Covenant (see Covenant).
Artaxerxes Longimanus, 428.
Asa, 403.
Asarhaddon, 400.
Ashera, worship of, 390.
Assyria, 396 seq., 408 seq., 412, 520.
Athaliah, 404.
Athenagoras, 469.
Atonement, the day and designation of, 309 ; date of, 309 ; rites of, 311 ; signification of, 315 ; antiquity of, 315.
Atoning sacrifice, 264, 300 seq.
Atwater, E. E., 254.
Auberlen, 39, 73, 151.
Augustine, 22, 185, 229, 707.
Authorities, theocratic : legislative, 217 ; judicial, 219 ; executive, 223.
Authorship, prophetic, 406.
Azariah, the prophet, 403 ; the king, 405.
Azazel, 159, 450.

B.

Baal, worship of, 390.
Baal-Berith, 359.
Baasha, 388.
Babel, 56.
Babylon, 499, 502.
Bachmann, 347.
Bähr, 75, 215, 218, 247, 254, 261, 271, 279, 296, 361, 321, 322, 326, 330, 347, 349, 380.
Baier, 30.
Balaam, 76, 479, 522.
Ban, 81, 293.
Baudissin, 40, 53, 63, 78, 89, 94, 96, 97, 105, 108, 251, 314, 389, 438.
Baruch, 402.
Bauer, Bruno, 36, 192, 194, 465, 475.
Bauer, Lor., 33, 34.
Baumgarten-Crusius, 33.
Baur, F. C., 33, 35, 192, 194, 329, 347.
Baur, G., 59, 157, 166.
Beck, J. T., 145, 483.
Bellarmine, 27.
Bengel, J. A., 30, 31, 108, 110, 490, 527.
Benjamin, tribe of, 385.
Berosus, 418.

Bertheau, 187, 360, 419, 427, 430, 494.
Bestmann, 194, 270, 558.
Bethel, 387, 392.
Bleek, 310.
Blessing, in Abraham's seed, 62 ; parental, 66, 67 ; divine, 195.
Blood, avenging of, 236 seq.
Blood, 152, 263, 276 seq., 306, 312.
Body, 149.
Böhl, 486, 512, 529, 533, 535.
Böttcher, 151, 172, 515.
Bredenkamp, 40, 47, 67, 75, 191, 202, 213, 251, 300, 303, 454, 455.
Briggs, C. A., 41.
Brotherhood, 56, 148.
Brown, F., 261.
Bruch, 383, 538.
Buddensieg, 50, 53, 411.
Buddeus, 30.
Burk, 30, 540.
Burnt-offering, 211, 263, 284.
Burnt-offering, altar of, 253, 255.
Buttmann, 33.
Buxtorf, 439.

C.

Caiaphas, 466, 479.
Calixtus, 28.
Calf worship, 388, 389.
Calvin, 25, 27, 165, 189, 526.
Canaanites, hardening of, 123, 165 ; extermination of, 81 ; incomplete, 84 ; selfdom of, 244.
Candlestick in the sanctuary, 256.
Canon, 10.
Capital punishment, 222.
Captivity, Assyrian, 398 ; Babylonian, 420, 422.
Carchemish, 417.
Caspari, 410, 446, 457, 494, 529.
Cassel, 65.
Census, 77, 371.
Ceremonial law, 182, 451.
Chaldeans, 417.
Cherubim, 257, 379 seq.
Children, the blessing of, 148, 196, 553.
Chronicles, 367.
Circumcision, historical origin of, 191 ; religious import of, 193.
Civil institutions, 553.
Clement of Alexandria, 93, 187.
Clericus, 31, 247.
Cocceius, 29, 461.
Collegia biblica, 30.
Cölln, 33, 439.
Coming of the Lord, 521.
Condition, physical, of the organs of revelation, 142, 474.
Conscience, 153, 158, 183 ; predictions of, 482.
Countenance, the Divine, 127.
Court of the Tabernacle, 254.
Courts of the Temple, 379.
Covenant, first breach of, 74 ; book of the, 46, 79, 184 ; ark of the, 257, 356, 361, 372, 381, 521 ; sacrifices of, 263.
Covenant of God with Israel, 175 ; new, 19, 457, 507.
Covenants of promise, 56, 60, 175.
Covering, in atonement, 277.
Creation, account of the, 50 ; doctrine of, 116 ; Babylonian tradition of, 50.
Cremer, 151.
Creuzer, 33.
Criticism, 8.
Crusius, 30, 471.
Cultus. See Worship.
Cuneiform inscriptions, 50, 53, 398, 399, 411, 413, 422.
Cup of Trembling, 449.
Curse, the Divine, 195.
Cursing, water of, 230, 321.
Curtiss, 12, 205.
Cuthah, 399.
Cuthites, 399.
Cuvier, 51.
Cyprian, 133.
Cyrus, 424.

D.

Dan, 385.
Daniel, 424, 453, 474, 476, 478.
Daniel, Book of, 434, 496, 503, 528.
Darius Hystaspis, 427.
Dates, prophetic, 488.
David, anointing of, 369 ; reign of, 371 ; theocratic position of, 372 seq. ; religious character of, 373 ; zeal for Divine worship, 375 ; promise to, 372, 523.
Day of mourning, 423.
Day of the Lord, 409.
Dead, region of the, 170 seq., 551, 557
Death, fear of, 557.
Death, the consequence of sin, 166.
Deborah, 354, 355, 364.
Decalogue, its division, 184 ; its system, 188.
Deism, Deists, 30, 198, 266.
Delitzsch, Franz, 12, 39, 40, 94, 97, 102, 117, 131, 134 seq., 139, 145, 151, 155 seq., 169, 205, 251, 262, 266, 303, 347, 383, 386, 400, 440, 479, 503, 519, 522, 533, 540, 542, 560.
Delitzsch, Friedrich, 329.
Deliverance from Egypt, 70.
Deluge, traditions of the, 54.
Demosthenes, 20.
Dettinger, 111, 135.
Deutero-Isaiah, 424, 453, 456, 460, 489, 517, 532.
Deuteronomy, 46, 78, 130, 177, 184 seq., 204, 207, 219 seq., 224, 240 seq., 324, 349, 352, 486.
Devotion, vow of, 292.
De Wette, 33, 35 seq., 42, 198, 358, 472.
Deyling, 265.
Diestel, 32, 59 seq., 108 seq., 173, 316.

Dilation, law of, 490.
Dillman, 12, 40, 191, 202, 205, 213, 243, 251 seq., 273, 289, 300, 301, 303 seq., 307, 309, 314, 334 seq., 345, 351, 543, 544, 550, 563, 565.
Discipline, 545, 554, 561.
Dispensation, a new, necessary, 455.
Divination, natural, 481.
Divorce, 231.
Dog, price of a, 294.
Dominion, extent of, Israelite, 77.
Dorner, 14.
Doves or pigeons, offering of, 269.
Drechsler, 96.
Dreams, 142 seq., 478.
Drink-offering, 273.
Düsterdieck, 481.
Duhm, 40, 389, 455, 474, 534.

E.

Ebers, 66.
Ebrard, 490.
Ecclesiastes, its composition, 429, 565; canonicity, 430; standpoint, 565; doctrine of retribution, 566; doctrine of immortality, 567; ethics, 568; transition to the New Testament, 569.
Ecstasy of the prophets, 469.
Eden, 137.
Edomites, 59, 76, 192, 422, 501, 518.
Education of children, 233, 553, 554.
Egypt, as confirming the Bible, 66, 68, 70, 81, 84, 192.
Eichhorn, 390.
Elah, 388.
Elders, 220.
Election of Israel, 176 seq., 197 seq.
Eli, 357, 361.
Eliezer, the prophet, 403.
Elihu, 562.
Elijah, 173.
Elisha, 391, 395.
Elkanah, 363.
Elohim, 57, 61, 87, 98 seq., 146, 219.
Elohistic narrative in Genesis I., 51.
Encampment, 74.
Enemies, love of, 549.
Enigmas of human life, 556; struggle for their solution in the Psalms, 557; in Job, 561; renunciation of their solution in Ecclesiastes, 565.
Enoch, 54, 165, 173.
Ephod, 215, 359.
Esarhaddon, 399.
Esther, 428, 430.
Eternity of God, 100.
Eudæmonism, apparent, of the Old Testament, 196, 552.
Eusebius, 133.
Evil, 52, 122, 554.
Ewald, 11, 13, 33, 39, 49, 71 seq., 97, 118, 166, 276, 286, 189, 295, 303, 317, 325, 342, 344, 384, 398, 407, 416, 428, 459, 502, 529, 534, 543, 545, 551.
Exegesis, 36 seq.
Exile, Assyrian, 398; Babylonian, 419, 423.
Existence of God, 16, 540.
Ezekiel, 418, 419 seq., 423, 439, 445, 453, 455, 458, 473, 476 seq., 502.
Ezra 429, 431 seq. 434 seq.

F.

Faith, 154, 459, 567.
Faithfulness of God, 95, 112 seq., 505.
Families, laws concerning, 234.
Fasting, 293, 309, 423.
Fatherhood of God, 178, 456.
Fat, offering of to God, 290 seq.
Fear of the Lord, 546.
Festivals, Mosaic, 323.
Figurative prophecy, 524.
Filling the hand, 211, 213.
Fire, sacred, the 385.
First-born, both kinds of, 203; redemption of, 232, 298; rights of, 234; of cattle, 298.
First-fruits, 298.
Fisher, G. P., 83.
Flood, traditions of, 54 seq.
Flour, offering of, 306.
Food-offering, 474, 478.
Four, the number, 260.
Fowls, 269.
Free cities, 208, 237.
Fundamental articles of Judaism, 7.

G.

Gabler, 33.
Gabriel, 446.
Gad, 371, 374.
Gedaliah, 421.
Geffcken, 187.
Genius, religious, of Israel, 14.
Genesis I. and II., connection between, 51 seq.
George, 325.
Gerhard, 27, 29.
Ghillany, 267.
Gibeonites, 376.
Gideon, 354, 359, 368.
Gilgal, 385.
Girls, names of, 194; education of, 554.
Glory of God, 110, 128.
Gnostics, 23.
God, existence of, 15; name of, 437; its change, 61, 63.
God, the, of heaven, 444.
God, the idea of, in Mosaism, 86; in prophetism, 437.
God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, 60, 126.
Godet, 111.
Gog, 502, 503.
Good, moral, realization of, in individual life, 551; in social circles, 555.

Graf, C. H., 12, 40, 358, 452.
Graf, E., 481.
Gramberg, 33, 414.
Grau, 59, 161.
Green, W. H., 12, 41, 205.
Gregory the Great, 24, 470.
Guilt, inherited, 94.
Gürtler, N., 28.

H.

Habakkuk, Book of, 465.
Haggai, 427, 502.
Hahn, H. A., 151, 525.
Hallel, 347.
Ham, Hamites, 56.
Hamann, 481.
Hanani, 403.
Hananiah, 420.
Hand, filling the, 211, 213.
Hand, laying of the, upon the sacrifice, 274, 305, 307.
Hand, the, of God, 466.
Hasse, 37.
Hävernick, 37, 163, 260, 439, 529.
Hazael, 391, 395.
Heart, 153.
Heathen nations, relation of to Israel, 180, 495 ; judgment of, 501 ; admission of into the kingdom of God, 516.
Heave offering, 290.
Heavenly bodies, the, 412.
Hegel, 10, 34, 35, 140, 149, 546.
Heiresses, 235.
Hengstenberg, 37, 38, 60, 62, 64, 78, 89 seq., 131 seq., 135, 170, 218, 343, 257 seq., 261 seq., 262, 288, 314, 316, 334, 335, 347 seq., 358, 360, 390, 399 seq., 430, 446, 459, 472, 477, 480, 486 seq., 491, 493 seq., 501, 503, 508, 510, 522, 524, 528, 532, 536, 560.
Herder, 35, 439.
Herzfeld, 377, 429.
Hesiod, 49.
Hess, 37.
Hezekiah, 400, 409.
Hhokhma (see Wisdom).
Hieronymus (see Jerome).
High-Priesthood, 201, 215; history of, 357, 374 seq., 582; of the Messiah, 543.
Hiller, 30.
Hinnom, 413, 415.
Historical Composition, Old Testament, 366 seq.
Historical and philosophical treatment of religion, 33 seq., 36 seq.
History, Israelitish, 7, 9.
Hitzig, 343, 162, 452, 515, 516, 526, 538, 556.
Hofmann, 2, 37, 350, 447, 528, 543.
Hölemann, 52, 92.
Holiness of God, 73, 87, 106, 159, 505 ; of Israel, 108 seq ; of places, 108 ; of sacrifices, 284 ; of seasons, 108.
Holy of Holies, 258, 378, 380.
Holy Things, 254 seq.
Hommel, 60.
Honey, 270.
Hophra, 419.
Horns of the altar of burnt offering, 253, 255.
Hosea, the prophet, 395, 407, 526.
Hoshea, 397.
Host of heaven, 439 seq.
Houses or families, 235.
Huldah, 414.
Human sacrifices, 64, 265, 360, 413.
Hupfeld, 39, 337, 340 seq., 347, 559.
Hyksos, 71.

I.

Idolatry, 388, 395.
Image of God, 143.
Immanuel, 527.
Immortality, 169, 174, 198, 551, 559, 567.
Imprecations in the Psalms, 558.
Incense, meaning of, 273.
Inheritance, law of, 234.
Intercession of the Servant of the Lord, 532.
Introduction, O. T., 7.
Irenæus, 133, 145.
Isaac, 64.
Isaiah, 398, 401, 406, 408, 473, 526
Ishmael, 61.
Islam, 17, 546.
Israel, 64.
Israel, tribes of, 66 seq., 200 seq., 382, 425.

J.

Jacob, 64, 122, 148, 234.
Japhet, Japhetites, 56.
Jahaziel, 403.
Jealousy of God, 114.
Jealousy offering, 232, 320.
Jehoahaz, of Israel, 395, 404; of Judah, 417.
Jehoiachin, 418.
Jehoiakim, 417 seq.
Jehonadab, 393, 394.
Jehoram of Israel, 393 ; of Judah, 404 seq.
Jehoshaphat, 403 ; valley of, 501.
Jehovah, the name, 126 ; pronunciation and grammatical explanation of, 92 seq. ; import of, 39; age and origin of, 96; comparison of with Elohim and El, 98.
Jehovah Sabaoth, 437 seq.
Jehu, the prophet, 388, 394, 403; the king, 393, 395.
Jephthah, 360.
Jeremiah, 402, 407, 415, 417, 452, 456, 466, 473, 478, 502, 562.
Jeroboam, 188, 384, 388.
Jeroboam II., 395.
Jerome, 470, 493.
Jerubbaal, 360.
Jerusalem, 63, 372, 374, 509.
Jews, 385 seq.

Jezebel, 390.
Joash of Israel, 395 ; of Judah, 404.
Job, Book of, 450, 556, 561.
Jochebed, 97.
Joel, 402, 404, 406, 490.
Jonah, 395 ; Book of, 492, 498.
Joseph, 66, 122 seq.
Joshua, 75, 81, 365 ; the high priest, 425 ; Book of, 84, 327, 355.
Josiah, 402, 414, 513, 535.
Jotham, 405 seq.
Jubilee, year of, law of, 337 ; import of, 342 ; practicability of the ordinance, 343.
Judah, tribe of, 66 seq.; kingdom of, 385, 400 seq.
Judges, Book of, 353 seq., 355 seq.
Judges, times of the, 353 seq.
Judgment, prediction of, upon Israel, 196, 500 ; upon the heathen nations, 501.
Jus talionis, 195.
Justice, administration of, 219, 403.
Justin Martyr, 23, 469.

K.

Kadesh-Barnea, 76.
Kahnis, 131.
Kaiser, G., Ph. Ch., 33.
Kant, 33, 34.
Kapporeth, 253, 257, 317.
Kautzsch, 113 seq., 400, 504.
Kayser, 40, 416.
Kebla, 137.
Keil, 102, 104, 135 seq., 167, 179, 255, 259 seq., 280, 301, 304 seq., 309 seq., 313, 323, 334, 342, 344, 430, 477, 511, 516, 520.
King, law of the, 224 ; consecration of, 369.
Kings, Book of, 368.
Kingship, 368 ; in Judah, 400, 402 ; the Divine, 199 ; the Messianic, 521, 528.
Kittel, R., 40, 259, 303.
Kleinert, 119, 427, 430, 520, 526.
Kliefoth, 262, 493, 515.
Knobel, 193, 283, 291 seq., 309.
Köhler, 18, 187, 194, 203, 273, 275, 280, 322, 358, 374, 517, 529.
König, 364, 367, 394, 465, 467, 477, 480, 483, 539.
Korah, 207.
Koran, 138.
Kranichfeld, 367.
Kurtz, 39, 64, 131, 185, 187, 262, 272, 282, 301, 308, 350.
Kübel, 440.
Kuenen, 10, 40, 365, 465.
Küper, 465.

L.

Land, Holy, its boundaries, 77 ; conquest, 81 ; division, 83 ; character, 83 ; promises concerning, 60, 62, 509.
Lardner, 31.
Lasaulx, 21, 481.
Laver in the court, 256.
Law, the, 182 ; relation between the moral and ceremonial, 183, 451 ; covenant of, 72 ; delight in, 456.
Leaven, 345, 349.
Lechler, K., 76, 188.
Lemme, 187, 190, 335.
Leprosy, its defilement, 319 ; purification from, 302 seq., 319.
Leprosy in houses, 319.
Lessing, 33.
Levi, 66, 74, 163, 202.
Levirate marriage, 235.
Levites, cities of the, 207, 208, 357, 433.
Levites, the, representation of Israel by, 203 ; official functions of, 206 seq.; social position of, 207 ; position of in the times of the Judges, 357 seq.; organization of under David, 376 ; their subsequent history, 388, 425, 426, 429, 430, 433.
Lydecker, 28.
Liebetrut, 330.
Life, 196, 550 ; eternal, see Immortality.
Light, 110, 256.
Living God, 100.
Logos, the, 133, 543.
Long-suffering of God, 74, 123.
Lord, the, 97 seq.
Lot, the, 122, 218.
Love of God, 177 ; to God, 184, 549 ; to our neighbor, 549.
Luther, 16, 25 seq., 96, 112, 190, 360, 430, 558.
Lutz, 39, 147.

M.

Maimonides, 24, 295, 470.
Majus, 29.
Malachi, 432, 434, 453.
Man, 256.
Man, idea of, 145 ; elements of his nature, 149.
Manasseh, the king, 412 ; the priest, 432.
Manicheans, 23.
Manticism, 20, 140, 143, 485.
Mantle of the prophets, 392.
Marcion, 22.
Marriage, its idea, 147, 553 ; a symbol of the fellowship of God with Israel, 456 ; law of, 226 ; conclusion of, 226 ; hindrances to, 228 ; dissolution of, 230 ; Roman law of, 230.
Mead, C. M., 152.
Meat-offering, 474, 478.
Mediatorship of the priesthood, 209.
Megiddo, 416.
Meier, E., 289.
Melanchthon, 25 seq.
Melchizedek, 61, 63, 201, 525.
Menahem, 396.
Menken, 36 seq., 108.

Mercy of God, 87, 115.
Mercy-seat. See Kapporeth.
Merx, 406.
Merz, 380.
Messianic hope, the, discrepant features of, 490, 521 ; its roots found in the Pentateuch, 522 ; its foundation in a narrower sense, 523 ; in the Psalms, 523 ; in the earlier prophets, 526 ; prophetic doctrine of the nature of the Messiah, 526 ; His office and work, 530 ; His sufferings, 531.
Metatron, 134.
Micha, Ephraimite, 356 seq., 359 ; the older prophet, 391, 449 ; the younger, 407, 410, 494, 526.
Michael, 446.
Michaelis, J. D., 31, 228, 243, 295, 342.
Mietziner, 240.
Milkom. See Moloch.
Miracles, 17, 124, 138, 362, 391.
Miriam, 364.
Mnevis worship, 68.
Moab, Moabites, 59, 180, 192, 516, 518.
Moloch, 63, 68, 69, 268, 413.
Momma, 28.
Monogamy, 148.
Monotheism, Semitic, 59 ; of Mosaism, 102.
Morgan, 32.
Moses, calling of, 70 ; mediatorial position, 74, 75 ; sinning of, 76 seq., 164 seq. ; death, 78 seq. ; importance, 80 ; a prophet, 363.
Movers, 63, 95, 368, 382, 410 seq.
Munk, 94.
Music, 366 seq., 375 seq.

N.

Naboth, 237.
Nadab, 388.
Nägelsbach, E., 39.
Nahum, 398, 417.
Name of God, 124, 127.
Names, significance of, 195 ; giving of, 194, 195.
Nathan, 372, 375, 378.
Nature, its relation to man, 156, 510 ; contemplation of, 121, 260, 543.
Nazarites, 262, 294, 302, 304, 365.
Nebuchadnezzar, 417, 479.
Necho, 416.
Nehemiah, 431.
Nethinim, 376.
Neumann, 262, 266, 289.
New-moon, 336 ; ditto Sabbath, 336 seq., 425.
New-year, 336, 425.
Niebuhr, 197.
Nitzsch, K. I., 44, 230, 247, 543.
Noachian commandments, 57.
Noadiah, 432.
Noah, 54, 165.
Nöldeke, 11, 252.
Numbering of the people, 77, 371, 448.

O.

Oath, the, a means of proof, 230 ; an act of worship, 250.
Oath of God, 176.
Obadiah, 406, 421, 504.
Obduracy, 123, 163.
Ode, 151.
Oded, 398.
Oetinger, 3, 30, 98, 110, 540, 545, 555.
Oil, at the offering, 273.
Omnipotence of God, 88, 91, 126.
Omnipresence of God, 111.
Omri, 390.
Orelli, 147, 192, 202, 374, 455, 477, 488, 504, 511, 515, 520, 523, 533, 536, 565.
Origen, 23, 93, 185, 469.
Oschwald, 331.
Otto, 125, 185.
Outram, 262, 276.

P.

Palms, 381.
Pan-offerings, 277.
Parents, authority and rights of, 232, 555.
Particularism, 180 ; overcome, 399.
Passover, enactments concerning, 345 seq. ; significance of, 348 seq. ; history of, 81, 399, 410, 415.
Patriarchs, 60, 65, 364.
Peace-offerings, their name and idea, 287 ; division, 288 ; material of, 289 ; ritual of, 289 ; existence of, in the times of the judges, 356.
Pekah, 397.
Pekahiah, 397.
Penalties of the Mosaic law, 222.
Pentateuch, criticism of, 9, 12, 75, 102, 120, 135, 141, 171, 175, 207, 243.
Periods, system of, 28.
Petermann, 434.
Perjury, 249.
Pharaoh, 70, 164.
Philo, 61, 80, 92, 185 seq., 254, 256, 469.
Pilgrimage festivals, 345.
Plagues of Egypt, 70 seq.
Pledges, laws concerning, 241.
Plural, quantitive and of majesty, 87 seq.
Plutarch, 20, 103.
Pœna vicaria, 275, 278, 308, 316, 322.
Polygamy, 148.
Polytheism, in the Old Testament, 88, 103 seq., 135 seq.
Præteritum propheticum, 488.
Pragmatism theocratic, 367.
Prayer, 256, 479.
Pre-existence of the soul, 151.
Presence of God, 124, 127, 130.
Preservation of the world, 119.
Priests, Priesthood, pre-Mosaic, 201 seq. ;

position and calling, 209 ; history, 357, 374, 375, 388, 402, 404, 413, 425, 431, 435 seq.; priesthood of Israel, 179 ; priestly consecration, 210 seq.; cities of, 207, 208, 212.
Primitive state, 153, 156 seq., 158 seq., 172, 182.
Prophecy, general office, 484 ; predictions of individual occurrences, 486 ; its peculiarities, 488 ; its relation to fulfilment, 487.
Prophecy of word and deed, 401 ; medium of revelation, 465 ; its history, 362, 370, 384, 386, 391, 392, 394, 402, 403, 432, 492.
Prophetic Books, connection between the, 407.
Prophetic consciousness, 464 seq. ; its earlier definition, 468 seq. ; definition in Protestant theology, 471.
Prophets, false, 391, 394, 419, 420, 434, 464, 478.
Prophetesses, sons of the, 392.
Prophets, schools of the, 365, 392.
Prophetship, its place in the theocracy, nature and import, 219, 362.
Proselytes, 426.
Protevangelium, 53, 522.
Proudhon, 236, 334.
Proverbs, Book of, 550 seq.
Providence, 121, 562.
Psalms, 373, 375, 531, 547, 551, 557, 558 ; Elohistic, 88, 92, 99 ; Messianic, 524 ; imprecatory, 558.
Psychology of nations, 59.
Pul, 396.
Purifications, Levitical, 319 ; from suspicion of guilt, 320 seq.
Purim, feast of, 428.
Purpose of the Creation, 121.

Q.

Queen-Mother, 402.

R.

Ranke, J. H., 203, 207.
Ranke, L., 374, 411.
Raphael, 447.
Rationalism, 33.
Rawlinson, 412.
Rechabites, 393 seq.
Redemption, the future, 505.
Redemption of family possessions, 235 seq.
Red Sea, 70.
Reformation in Judah, 402, 404, 414.
Rehoboam, 385, 400.
Reichel, 503.
Remnant of Israel, 507 ; of the heathen, 516.
Renan, 59.
Repentance of God, 492 seq.
Resurrection, 513 seq., 560 seq.
Rest from labor at festivals, 326 seq.
Retribution, Mosaic doctrine of, 195 seq.; its relation to Divine election, 197 seq.; attacks upon, 198 ; the Hhokhma upon, 248, 561, 556.
Return of the Jews, 424 seq.
Reuben, 66.
Reuchlin, 24 seq.
Reuss, 40, 191, 251, 358, 374 seq., 376, 433, 543.
Revelation, 11 seq. ; general, 14 ; special, 15 ; forms of, 128 seq.
Revelation side of the Divine Being, 124.
Rezin, 408.
Riehm, 203, 208 seq., 224 seq., 238 seq., 259, 276, 280, 299, 301, 304 seq., 309, 318, 334, 340, 358, 447, 481, 485, 496, 524, 530, 534.
Riggenbach, 254, 255.
Righteousness of God, 112, 497 ; of man, 165, 181, 183, 459, 507, 557.
Ritschl, 20, 114 seq., 280 seq.
Ritter, 84.
Ritual. See ceremonial law.
Rod, Aaron's, 209.
Roos, 30, 31, 145.
Rougemont, 462.
Rosenkranz, 6, 183.
Rothe, 8 seq., 21, 481.
Rupprecht, 108, 110.
Rust, 34.
Ruth, 370 ; Book of, 235.

S.

Saalschütz, 110, 221.
Sabaoth. See Jehovah.
Sabbath, creation, 50 ; weekly, antiquity and origin of, 326 seq.; idea of, 332 ; observance of, 334.
Sabbatical year, law of the, 337 ; import of, 342 ; practicability of keeping, 343.
Sack, K. H., 43.
Sacrifice, idea of, 261 ; pre-Mosaic, 54 seq., 56, 263, 265 ; origin of, 265 ; material of, 266 seq. ; principle on which the material is fixed, 272 ; ritual of, 274 ; kinds of, 287.
Sacrificial doctrine of the Hhokhma, 547 seq.
Sacrificial flesh, consumption of, by the priests, 307.
Sacrificial repasts, 292.
Salem, 63.
Salt, 270 seq.
Salvation, experience of, 19, 461.
Samaria, 390, 396.
Samaritans, 399, 426, 432, 434.
Samson, 296 seq.
Samuel, 294, 359, 361, 362, 365, 368, 370.
Sanballat, 432.
Sanchoniathon, 93.

Sanctuary, Mosaic, arrangement of, 252 seq. ; signification of its parts, 254 ; and vessels, 255 ; tribute for, 299.
Sargon, 398, 411.
Satan, 159, 314, 448 seq.
Saturn, worship of, 69, 192, 331.
Saubert, 262.
Saul, 144, 370, 448.
Schelling, 34, 63, 320.
Schleiermacher, 2, 21, 487.
Schmid, Ch. F., 6, 12.
Schmid, S., 30.
Schmieder, 108, 452, 529.
Schnell, 221, 344.
Scholasticism, 24.
Schrader, 96, 98, 135, 330, 398, 411, 439.
Schultz, 6, 11, 16, 39, 44 seq., 60, 62, 67, 75, 89 seq., 96, 98, 105, 131, 134, 136, 137, 147, 168, 191, 194, 251 seq., 260, 273, 280, 281, 389, 439, 486, 525, 533, 535, 564.
Scorners, 384.
Scribes, 434.
Scythians, 416.
Seasons, sacred, review of, 323 ; designations of, 324 ; times of, 324 ; celebration of, 326.
Seed of Abraham, 522.
Seer, 364, 475, 477.
Semler, 31.
Sennacherib, 409, 411.
Seraphim, 444 seq.
Serpent, brazen, 76 seq.
Servant, the, of the Lord, 181, 517, 532.
Servile classes, 239 ; Israelite, 240 ; non-Israelite, 244.
Seven, the number, 256, 324, 328, 331, 333, 445.
Sexual relation of man and woman, 147.
Shalamim. See Peace-offerings.
Shallum, 396.
Shalmanezer, 398.
Shamgar, 354.
Shekhina, 112, 137, 254, 255, 431.
Shemaiah, the prophet, 385 ; the false prophet, 420.
Shem, Semites, 56, 58.
Sheol, 170, 512, 551, 557, 567.
Shew-bread, 253, 256.
Shiloh, 83, 522.
Shishak, 403.
Shopheten. See Judges.
Shuckford, 31.
Simeon, 77, 79, 385.
Sin, origin of, 52, 158 ; a disturbance of the aim of the world, 121 ; its relation to divine causality, 122 ; Old Testament names of, 158 ; an inclination, 161 ; hereditary, 162 ; resistible, 164 ; degrees of, 164 seq. ; increasingly profound perception of in the prophets, 455 ; forgiveness of, 461, 507.
Sin-offering, definition of, 301, 303 ; ritual of, 305 ; import of, 307 ; not mentioned in the Book of Judges, 356 ; lacking in the days of redemption, 453.
Sirach, 12, 549.
Slaughter of the victim, 275.
Slaves, Slavery, 239 seq., 244 ; female, 245.
Sleep, prophetic, 478.
Smend, 516.
Smith, G., 328 ; W. R., 11, 12, 205, 365 ; R. P., 365.
So, 398.
Socinianism, 27, 29, 146, 185.
Solomon, reign of, 378 seq. ; founder of the Hhokhma, 383 ; Song of, 553.
Song, sacred, 233, 366, 372, 373, 375.
Sonship, Divine, 460 ; of the people, 178, 456 ; of the king, 374 ; of the Messiah, 524.
Sopherism, 434.
Soul, 149.
Spencer, 31, 32, 265.
Spener, 30.
Spirit of God, 112 ; in creation, 118 ; in preservation, 119 ; the vehicle of revelation, 124, 133, 362, 465 ; the principle of regeneration, 463, 507.
Spirit, the, of man, 149.
Spirituality of God, 112.
Stade, 467.
Stähelin, 208.
Stars, worship of, 413.
Steudel, 6, 21, 36, 38, 131.
Stickel, 563.
Stier, 12.
Stuhr, 36.
Substitution, 262, 532.
Suffering, import of, 531, 554, 561 seq.
Sulpicius Severus, 22, 23.
Supernaturalism, earlier, 17 seq., 36 seq., 473.
Susannah, Book of, 423.
Sykes, 262.
Symbol in worship, 246.
Symbolism, prophetic, 476.
Synagogue, 403, 423 ; the great, 435.
Syncretism, 68, 359 seq.

T.

Tabernacle, 75, 84, 251, 356, 361, 372, 376, 381.
Tabernacles, feast of, 352, 388.
Table of nations, 57.
Talmud, 163, 538.
Temple of Solomon, preparation for, 375 ; building of, 378 ; description of, 379 ; vessels of, 379 ; significance of, 380 seq. ; dedication, 381 ; in the latter days, 519.
Ten, the number, 184, 188.
Ten tribes, kingdom of, 387.
Teraphim, 58, 60.
Tertullian, 23, 469, 514.
Testament, Old, practical import of, 1

seq.; Old and New, their mutual relation, 2 seq., 18 seq., 36, 559, 569; their relation to heathenism, 18.
Thank-offering, 286.
Thenius, 367, 415.
Theocracy, 199, 223.
Theodidasklia of the new covenant, 363, 508.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 428.
Theodoret, 429.
Theology, biblical, the name, 32; method of, 41; Old Testament definition of, 4; importance to divinity, 2; relation to other Old Testament subjects, 7; history of, 22; divisions of, 43.
Theophany, 99, 124.
Therapeutæ, 245.
Thiersch, 229.
Tholuck, 465, 469, 477, 494.
Tibni, 389.
Tiglath-Pileser, 397, 408.
Tirzah, 390.
Tithes, 298, 388.
Topical lectures, 30.
Tribes, heads of, 225.
Tributes, the theocratic, 298.
Trichotomy of man, 151.
Trinity, the, 88, 133, 142.
Trip, 131.
Trumpets, sounding of, 336.
Tutelary spirits, national, 447.
Twelve, the number, 381.

U.

Umbreit, 33, 145, 147, 519, 524, 526.
Unchangeableness of God, 95, 100.
Unity of God, 102.
Universality of the Divine Kingdom, 496.
Urijah the prophet, 417.
Urim and Thummim, 215, 218, 435.
Uzziah, 405, 406.

V.

Vatke, 34, 36, 45, 358, 364, 382, 390, 413, 440, 484.
Vilmar, 297.
Visions, 142 seq., 476.
Vitringa, 29, 472.
Voice, the Divine, 128.
Vows, 292.

W.

Warburton, 31.
Watchman, prophetic office of, 365, 369, 476.
Water of cursing, 320.
Waving, 207, 211, 290.
Weber, 115.
Week, the cycle of, 328.
Weeks, feast of, 150.
Wellhausen, 12, 40, 75, 84, 191, 202, 205, 208, 212, 213, 251, 299, 303, 318, 330, 337, 340, 349, 358, 410, 433, 454.
Winer, 125, 170, 303, 425, 430.
Wisdom, Old Testament, 43, 382 seq.; the Books of, 537; relation to revelation and to worldly wisdom, 537; its principle of knowledge, 540; form, 540; divine, 541; its personification, 543; its part in the universe, 541 seq.; its intervention in human affairs, 545; human wisdom, 546; practical, 547; Book of, 13, 152.
Witsius, 29, 463, 472.
Woman, position of, 226; heathen, 227, 429.
Word, the, its place in worship, 248.
Word of God, 94, 116, 128, 542.
World, the, ages of, 49; covenant of, 56.
World, the, kingdoms of, 503. See also Gentiles.
Worship, nature of, 246; state of in the times of the Judges, 355 seq.; under David, 375; after the captivity, 434 seq.; prophetic view of, 452; place of, 501.
Wrath of God, 115.
Wurm, P., 90, 100.

X.

Xerxes, 428.

Z.

Zachariæ, 33, 34, 106.
Zachariah, the king, 396; the prophet, 405.
Zadok, the high priest, 213, 375, 377; the scribe, 436.
Zechariah, 427, 476, 534.
Zedekiah, the king, 419; the false prophet, 421.
Zephaniah, 407, 415, 416.
Zerah, 403.
Zerubbabel, 425.
Zezschwitz, 187.
Zimri, 388.
Zion, 372.
Zöckler, 539, 545, 548, 551, 552.
Züllig, 186.

TEXTUAL INDEX.

GENESIS. PAGES

i. 1, sq.... 51, 53, 99, 116
i. 2.... 53, 117
i. 3, 6, 9.... 116, 117
i. 11.... 119
i. 14.... 50, 325, 440
i. 22.... 52
i. 24.... 149
i. 26.... 88, 103, 145, 149
i. 27.... 88, 117, 147
i. 28.... 52, 148
i. 29.... 157
i. 31.... 52, 121, 156
ii.... 137
ii. 1, 2.... 119, 328, 438
ii. 3.... 120, 332
ii. 4.... 50, 51, 99
ii. 7, 9..119, 146, 149, 150, 551
ii. 16.... 52
ii. 17, 18....147, 157, 158, 166, 168
ii. 19, sq.... 146
ii. 20.... 146
ii. 25.... 156
iii.... 157, 158, 159, 259
iii. 1-3.... 158
iii. 1, 4.... 159, 161
iii. 2, 5.... 156, 158
iii. 6, 7.... 159, 164
iii. 8.... 52, 157
iii. 10, 14.... 161, 321
iii. 15.... 52, 53, 522
iii. 17....52, 122, 157, 342
iii. 18.... 157
iii. 19.... 157, 167
iii. 21.... 168
iii. 22.... 52, 53, 146, 157, 160, 167, 551
iii. 24.... 137, 259
iv.... 135, 162, 263
iv. 1.... 148, 523
iv. 3, 6.... 164, 262
iv. 7.... 160, 166
iv. 10.... 174, 237
iv. 14.... 137, 238
iv. 18, 19.... 87, 148
iv. 23, 24.... 9, 54, 55
iv. 25.... 148
iv. 26.... 54, 99, 135
v. 22.... 165
v. 24.... 173
v. 29.... 54, 121, 157, 332, 523
vi. 1-4.... 55
vi. 1, sq.... 135, 136
vi. 3....120, 121, 141, 161, 168
vi. 5.... 162

GENESIS. PAGES

vi. 18, 17.... 120, 150
vii. 1.... 165
vii. 4, 10.... 328
vii. 15, 16.... 99, 100, 150
vii. 21, 22.... 149, 169
viii. 2.... 110
viii. 10, 12.... 328
viii. 20...56, 250, 263, 265
viii. 21.... 119, 121, 153, 162, 263, 265
ix. 2.... 146
ix. 4.... 56, 152, 277
ix. 5.... 237
ix. 6.... 145, 146, 236
ix. 9.... 175
ix. 11.... 121
ix. 25, 27....57, 162, 239
ix. 26, sq.... 99
x. 8.... 56
x. 21.... 58
xi.... 58, 499
xi. 7.... 103
xi. 31.... 58
xii. 1.... 58, 178, 525
xii. 3....57, 121, 495, 522
xii. 5.... 150
xii. 6.... 60, 81, 356
xii. 7, 8.... 97, 250
xiii. 7.... 81
xiii. 15.... 60
xiv. 13.... 58, 59
xiv. 14.... 239
xiv. 18-22.... 61, 63
xiv. 18.... 89
xv.... 266
xv. 2, 8.... 101, 239
xv. 6.... 61, 165, 181, 459
xv. 9.... 269
xv. 12, 13....65, 71, 143
xv. 15.... 196
xv. 16.. 123, 160, 163, 196
xv. 18.... 77
xvi. 2, 3.... 148
xvi. 7, 11.... 129
xvi. 13..101, 102, 112, 129
xvi. 14.... 100
xvii.... 193
xvii. 1...91, 126, 181, 194
xvii. 5-8.... 60
xvii. 5.... 194
xvii. 6, 7.... 175, 224
xvii. 11, 12..191, 257, 328
xvii. 14.... 150
xvii. 16.... 224
xvii. 23.... 239
xviii. 3, 5.... 101, 153
xviii. 18....60, 121, 495, 522

GENESIS. PAGES

xviii. 19..61, 63, 178, 181, 233
xviii. 20, sq.... 129
xviii. 23....61, 532
xviii. 25.... 113
xviii. 26, sq.... 196
xviii. 27, 30....101, 168
xix. 13, 18.... 129, 132
xix. 24.... 133
xix. 36.... 162
xx 3, 6.... 143
xx. 4.... 101
xx. 7.... 61, 364
xx. 13, 16....89, 278
xxi. 3.... 194
xxi. 4.... 328
xxi. 17.... 121, 129
xxi. 28.... 249
xxi. 32, sq.... 234
xxii....178, 262, 266
xxii. 11.... 267
xxii. 12, 14.... 129
xxii. 16.... 60, 132
xxii. 18..61, 495, 522, 524
xxii. 24.... 148
xxii. 28.... 119
xxiii. 4.... 61
xxiv. 2.... 249
xxiv. 3.... 229
xxiv. 7, 40.... 130
xxiv. 35.... 239
xxiv. 53, 58.... 229
xxv. 6.... 148
xxv. 8.... 170, 196
xxv. 9, 13.... 87, 172
xxv. 21.... 148
xxv. 23.... 64
xxvi. 2-5.... 64
xxvi. 4.... 495, 522
xxvi. 12, 14....239, 344
xxvi. 19.... 234
xxvi. 24.... 174, 181, 250
xxvi. 35.... 151
xxvii. 29.... 84
xxvii. 42.... 64
xxvii. 45.... 236, 238
xxviii. 3.... 91
xxviii. 10, sq.... 64
xxviii. 12...130, 135, 143
xxviii. 13.... 174
xxviii. 14.... 495, 522
xxviii. 15...103, 105, 112, 121
xxviii. 17.... 108
xxviii. 18.... 250
xxviii. 20-22....292, 300
xxix. 18.... 241
xxix. 27.... 328

GENESIS. PAGES

xxix. 31, 32.....148, 195
xxx.... 195
xxx. 2.... 148
xxx. 3, 9.... 148
xxx. 17, 22, 23.... 148
xxx. 28.... 94
xxx. 35.... 58
xxxi. 12, 13.... 130
xxxi. 19.... 58
xxxi. 42.... 88
xxxi. 46, sq.... 234
xxxi. 53.... 60, 88, 249
xxxi. 54.... 263
xxxii. 2, sq.... 135
xxxii. 2.... 442
xxxii. 11.... 121
xxxii. 21.... 278
xxxii. 24, sq.....64, 65
xxxii. 29-31....128, 130
xxxii. 31.... 127
xxxiii. 11-13.... 128
xxxiii. 20.... 234
xxxiii. 23.... 128
xxxiv.....74, 75,
xxxiv. 3, 6, 8.... 151
xxxiv. 12.... 227
xxxv. 1, 14.... 250
xxxv. 2.... 106
xxxv. 4.... 356
xxxv. 7....81, 130, 234
xxxv. 9, sq.... 64
xxxv. 11.... 91
xxxv. 20.... 234
xxxv. 29.....170, 172
xxxvi. 31-39.... 224
xxxvi. 43.... 87
xxxvii. 6, sq.... 143
xxxvii. 35.... 170
xxxviii.... 234
xxxviii. 9.... 148
xli.... 143, 470
xli. 8.... 151
xli. 38.... 141
xliii. 14.... 91
xliv. 32.... 67
xlv. 5-7.... 121
xlv. 5-8.... 65
xlv. 8....122, 123
xlvi. 2, sq.... 65
xlvi. 4.... 112
xlvii. 20.... 62
xlvii. 29.... 249
xlviii. 3.... 91
xlviii. 5.... 66, 200
xlviii. 14.... 66
xlviii. 15.... 130
xlix.... 202
xlix. 1.... 489

GENESIS. PAGES

xlix. 3....201
xlix. 5-7....66, 202
xlix. 10....84, 522
xlix. 18....551
xlix. 25....91
xlix. 26....297
xlix. 33....170
l. 5, 25....249
l. 11....234
l, 13....172
l. 20....65, 121, 122

EXODUS.

ii. 1, sq....70
ii. 21....66
iii....133
iii. 2....130
iii. 5....108
iii. 6....66, 126, 174
iii. 8....83
iii. 13-15....93
iii. 13, sq....95
iii. 14, 15....94, 95, 96
iii. 15, sq....126
iii. 20....138
iii. 22....68, 72
iv. 10, 13....101
iv. 11....120
iv. 16....363
iv. 21...123, 154, 164, 165
iv. 22, sq....178
iv. 24, sq....193
iv. 31....459
v. 2....97
vi. 2, sq....98
vi. 3....90
vi. 6, sq....70
vi. 9....151
vi. 14....225
vi. 16-20....72
vi. 20....97
vii-xii....70
vii. 1....363, 365
vii. 3....123, 165
vii. 4....74, 438
vii. 13....155
viii. 5, sq....70
viii. 15, 28....140, 165
viii. 18, 19....70, 97, 139, 165
ix. 16....70, 123, 496, 497
ix. 27....113
ix. 34....165
x. 20....263
xii. 1-28....345
xii. 2....333, 336
xii. 12....70, 104
xii. 13....346, 451
xii. 14-17....218
xii. 15, 19....222
xii. 22....264
xii. 23....451
xii. 26, sq...233, 248, 346
xii. 27....348
xii. 33, sq....68
xii. 35, sq....71
xii. 38....180, 244
xii. 41....200, 438
xii. 43-49....345
xii. 44, 48....180, 244, 346
xii. 45....244, 340
xiii....203
xiii. 2....267
xiii. 3-9....345
xiii. 6, 8....233, 346
xiii. 9....326
xiii. 13..262, 267, 269, 298
xiii. 14, sq....233, 248
xiii. 15....165, 282
xiii. 21....130, 258
xiv. 19....130

EXODUS. PAGES

xiv. 24, sq....130
xiv. 31....71, 459
xv. 2....93
xv. 11....18, 70, 104, 106, 138, 140
xv. 13, sq....72
xv. 18....73, 199
xv. 20....248, 364
xvi. 5....328
xvi. 22-30....328
xvi. 23, 29....334, 335
xvii. 12....460
xvii. 15....528
xviii. 11, 12..70, 103, 263
xviii. 13, sq....220
xviii. 15....219
xviii. 19-26....219, 220
xviii. 21....226
xix. 1....73, 351
xix. 4....175, 179, 184, 246
xix. 5, sq..175, 177, 179, 181, 495
xix. 6....200
xix. 8....175, 181
xix. 10, 14....106
xix. 13....339
xix. 21....201
xix. 22, sq....201, 202
xx. 2....175, 176, 177, 184
xx. 1-17....184
xx. 2-6....184, 185
xx. 3, 6....102, 104, 186
xx. 4....111
xx. 5....114, 162, 238
xx. 6....163, 185
xx. 7, 8....127, 249, 328
xx. 9, 10....333
xx. 11....104, 332, 334
xx. 12....197, 232
xx. 17..164, 183, 184, 187
xx. 24, sq...246, 250, 253, 263
xxi. 1-11....241
xxi. 2....343
xxi. 6....219, 242
xxi. 7-11....242
xxi. 7....227
xxi. 10....148, 227, 232
xxi. 12, sq..122, 222, 245
xxi. 12-14....237
xxi. 13....122, 237
xxi. 14....237
xxi. 15, sq....232, 233
xxi. 20, sq....219, 245
xxi. 22....222
xxi. 23-25....195, 222
xxi. 28, sq....238
xxi. 30, 33....278
xxii. 2....240
xxii. 6-10....222
xxii. 8....90
xxii. 11....249
xxii. 12, 16....221, 227
xxii. 19....293
xxii. 20....240
xxii. 25, sq....241
xxii. 27....189, 219
xxii. 28, 29..154, 267, 269
xxiii. 6-8....222
xxiii. 9....240
xxiii. 10-17....324
xxiii. 10, sq....337
xxiii. 12, 14....327, 333
xxiii. 15....264, 323, 327, 345, 350
xxiii. 16....336, 351
xxiii. 17....233, 252, 327, 346
xxiii. 19....298
xxiii. 20, sq....130

EXODUS. PAGES

xxiii. 21....125, 142
xxiii. 20-33....492
xxiv....73, 176, 263, 431
xxiv. 5....202, 263
xxiv. 7....184
xxiv. 10, 11....143, 201
xxiv. 16....128
xxv. 2, sq....288, 289
xxv. 9, 40....255
xxv. 20....259
xxv. 22....252, 254, 257
xxv. 23-30....253, 256
xxv. 29, sq....256
xxvi. 1-14....253
xxvii. 1. sq....253
xxvii. 21....218
xxviii. 1....201
xxviii. 6....359
xxviii. 12, 29....214, 216
xxviii. 30....218
xxviii. 31, 35....215, 217
xxviii. 38....214, 217, 262
xxviii. 40-42....210
xxviii. 41....206
xxviii. 43....218
xxix....215
xxix. 1....206, 210
xxix. 1-37....210
xxix. 5-9....215
xxix. 6....215, 296
xxix. 7....213, 216
xxix. 7-12....206
xxix. 10....274, 305
xxix. 12....306
xxix. 14, 15....211, 305
xxix. 20....350
xxix. 21, 24..213, 264, 290
xxix. 30, sq....349
xxix. 33....280
xxix. 36....211, 305
xxix. 38-42....285
xxix. 42, sq....252
xxix. 43, sq....108, 246, 248, 250
xxx. 6....252
xxx. 10....312
xxx. 11-16....201
xxx. 12, sq...277, 280, 299
xxx. 17, sq....253
xxx. 18....321
xxx. 21....256
xxx. 30....213
xxxi. 3....141
xxxi. 13....191, 246, 328
xxxi. 13-17....332
xxxi. 14, 15....222, 330, 334
xxxi. 16. sq....176, 191
xxxi. 17....104
xxxii....68, 130
xxxii. sq, ...115, 201
xxxii. 4....388
xxxii. 4-8....89
xxxii. 5, 19....324
xxxii. 5....327
xxxii. 10, sq....114
xxxii. 15....184
xxxii. 26-29....75, 211
xxxii. 29....202
xxxii. 32, sq....278, 532
xxxiii. 3....130
xxxiii. 11, 12....79, 177
xxxiii. 14, sq....127, 130
xxxiii. 17, sq....128, 137
xxxiii. 19, 20..96, 97, 281
xxxiii. 34....130
xxxiv. 6....74, 115, 126, 197, 506
xxxiv. 7....160, 162
xxxiv. 9....101, 127
xxxiv. 10....139, 175

EXODUS. PAGES

xxxiv. 11-27....46, 191
xxxiv. 12, sq....81
xxxiv. 14, 16....114, 115, 227, 350
xxxiv. 20...262, 267, 269, 323, 327
xxxiv. 21....334
xxxiv. 22, 23....102, 337
xxxiv. 24, 25....189, 348
xxxiv. 31....223
xxxv. 2, 3....334
xxxv. 5....154
xxxv. 21....151, 289
xxxv. 29....288
xxxv. 31....141
xxxvi. 16....109
xxxvii. 26-28....109
xxxviii. 8....22, 297, 360
xxxviii. 25, sq....299
xxxix. 2, sq....359
xxxix. 18....350
xl....258
xl. 6....274
xl. 12-15....210
xl. 15....210, 213
xl. 34....110, 128, 250
xl. 34-38....137, 258
xl. 36-38....133

LEVITICUS.

i.-iii....284, 285
i. 1....284
i. 3, 4....274, 285
i. 5, 6....276, 282
i. 7-9....281
i. 9, 13....262, 282
i. 11, 15....275
i. 16....308
i. 17....262, 282
ii....270, 283
ii. 1, 2....270, 273, 282
ii. 3....262
ii. 4, sq....270
ii. 9....291
ii. 11, 12....270
ii. 13....271
ii. 14, 15....270, 273
iii. 2....274, 289
iii. 3-5....290
iii. 3, 9....262
iii. 6....289
iii. 9-11....290
iii. 11, 16....272
iii. 13....276
iii. 14-16....290
iv....284
iv. 1, sq....237, 284
iv. 2....164, 300, 310
iv. 3, 5..214, 317, 305, 308
iv. 4....274
iv. 5-16....306
iv. 6, 17....277
iv. 8....291
iv. 10, 19....282, 291
iv. 11-21....306
iv. 12....282, 308
iv. 13....217, 302
iv. 13, sq....300, 305, 308
iv. 22, 28....164, 300, 306
iv. 24....275
iv. 28, 32....306
iv. 29....275
iv. 30, 34....277, 306
iv. 31....307
iv. 33....262, 275
v. 1....221, 249
v. 1-13....301
v. 2, 3....300, 319
v. 4, sq....249, 250
v. 6, 7....269, 301, 306
v. 10....461

LEVITICUS. PAGES

v. 11.....267, 273, 301
v. 12.....262, 283, 309
v. 13, 14.....301, 308
v. 14, sq.....301
v. 14, 20.....284
v. 15, 18....300, 302, 304, 305
v. 17-19.....300, 301
v. 21, sq.....249
v. 26.....278
vi. 1, sq.....213
vi. 1-6.....301
vi. 2-6.....314
vi. 5, sq.....282
vi. 7, sq.....283
vi. 8, 9, sq.....283, 291
vi. 10.....284
vi. 12, sq.....267, 282
vi. 15, sq.....282
vi. 17-23.....305
vi. 18.....275, 284
vi. 22.....284, 306
vi. 23, 28.....280, 306
vi. 27.....318
vii.....276
vii. 1.....284
vii. 1-7.....305
vii. 2.....276
vii. 6.....283, 284
vii. 7.....276, 280
vii. 8.....285
vii. 11, sq.....288
vii. 12, sq.....289
vii. 13.....271, 292
vii. 15.....288, 291
vii. 16-18.....288
vii. 18.....509
vii. 19.....292
vii. 23-25.....290
vii. 29-34.....290
vii. 33.....292
vii. 35, sq.....213
vii. 37.....211, 284
viii.....210
viii. 8.....218
viii. 12.....213, 216
viii. 15.....211
viii. 20, 22.....211, 282
viii. 25, sq.....292
viii. 27.....290
viii. 28, 30.....211, 213
viii. 33, sq.....211, 213
ix. 3, 15.....269, 306
ix. 4.....289
ix. 18.....287, 289
ix. 19, sq.....290
ix. 22, 24....137, 246, 282
x.....282
x. 2.....126, 282
x. 3.....211
x. 7.....217
x. 9, sq.....295
x. 10, 11.....209
x. 12.....284
x. 17.....278, 307
xi.....268
xi. 4-6.....269
xi. 8.....319
xi. 23, sq.....319
xi. 39, sq.....319
xi. 44.....106, 270
xi. 44, sq.....182, 268
xii.....162, 319
xii. 6, 8.....269
xii. 20.....292
xiii. sq.....319
xiv. 1-32.....320
xiv. 5, 6.....319, 320
xiv. 7.....316
xiv. 10.....269, 304
xiv. 11. sq.....302

LEVITICUS. PAGES

xiv. 13-25.....275
xiv. 20.....283, 285
xiv. 21, sq.....301
xiv. 22.....306
xiv. 33, sq.....319
xiv. 33-57.....320
xiv. 50, 51.....312, 319
xv.....162, 319
xv. 4, sq.....319
xv. 15, 30.....278
xvi.....311, 319, 450
xvi. 2.....137, 258
xvi. 3, 5....305, 306, 313
xvi. 5, 9.....318
xvi. 8, sq.....159
xvi. 8.....311
xvi. 10.....311, 315
xvi. 12.....312
xvi. 13, sq.....258
xvi. 15.....318
xvi. 16..310, 312, 314, 348
xvi. 17.....312
xvi. 18.....314
xvi. 21..276, 310, 312, 314
xvi. 21, sq.....314
xvi. 23.....310, 313
xvi. 24.....285, 315
xvi. 26-32.....310
xvi. 27, 28..280, 306, 312
xvi. 29.....293
xvi. 29-31.....313
xvi. 30, 34.....310
xvi. 31, 32.....213, 327
xvii. 1, sq.....251
xvii. 3, sq.....251
xvii. 5.....356
xvii. 7.....68, 309
xvii. 8.....286
xvii. 11.....152, 277, 317
xvii. 14.....152, 277
xviii. 2, sq.....74, 186
xviii. 3.....228
xviii. 6-18.....228
xviii. 17.....229
xviii. 18....146, 227, 229
xviii. 21.....267
xviii. 24.....228
xix. 2.....106, 182, 186
xix. 4.....101, 104
xix. 6, 7.....179, 291, 309
xix. 11.....319
xix. 12.....189, 249
xix. 14-16.....319
xix. 15.....222
xix. 17, sq.....183
xix. 18, 19..182, 220
xix. 20-22.....230, 302
xix. 26.....140
xix. 28.....273
xix. 29.....230
xix. 31.....140, 171
xix. 32.....188, 190
xx.....222
xx. 2.....267
xx. 4-6.....222
xx. 5, 6.....171, 456
xx. 7.....182
xx. 8, 9.....106, 232
xx. 10.....230, 232
xx. 11-14.....228
xx. 11-21.....228
xx. 12.....229
xx. 14.....229
xx. 17, 19.....228, 229
xx. 23.....74, 228
xx. 24-26...83, 107. 110, 179, 269
xx. 27.....140, 171
xxi.....208
xxi. 1, sq.....210
xxi. 4.....213

LEVITICUS. PAGES

xxi. 6.....272
xxi. 7, sq.....210
xxi. 8.....106, 272
xxi. 10.....216, 296
xxi. 10-15.....217
xxi. 11, 12.....217, 295
xxi. 16-24.....209
xxi. 17.....272
xxi. 22.....306
xxii. 2.....210
xxii. 11, 12.....245, 291
xxii. 18, 21.....288
xxii. 19.....309
xxii. 21-24.....269
xxii. 23.....288, 309
xxii. 25, 27.....269, 272
xxii. 29, sq.....291
xxiii.....324, 327
xxiii. 2, 3, 4.....324, 327
xxiii. 5, sq.....345
xxiii. 6-8.....346
xxiii. 7, 8.....327
xxiii. 11, 15..227, 346, 350
xxiii. 17.....270, 351
xxiii. 18, 25..286, 313, 351
xxiii. 21.....327
xxiii. 27, 29.....293, 313
xxiii. 28, 31.....327
xxiii. 35, 36....323, 327, 351, 352
xxiii. 37.....288
xxiii. 42, sq.....326, 351
xxiv. 7.....263, 271, 283
xxiv 8.....256, 335
xxiv. 10.....180
xxiv. 11.....92, 94, 220
xxiv. 16.....92, 94
xxiv. 17.....245
xxiv. 18.....222
xxv.....324
xxv. 1-7.....337
xxv. 2.....338, 342, 344
xxv. 4.....337
xxv. 5.....296
xxv. 8, 10.....338, 339
xxv. 9.....337, 339
xxv. 11.....296, 339, 341
xxv. 20, sq.....338, 340
xxv. 21, sq.....342
xxv. 23..235, 339
xxv. 23-27.....235
xxv. 32, sq.....208
xxv. 39.....241, 243, 339
xxv. 39-43.....242
xxv. 39-47.....240
xxv. 39 55.....241
xxv. 42.....181, 342
xxv. 42-55.....239, 240
xxv. 44, sq.....240
xxv. 47-55.....242
xxv. 55.....181, 239
xxvi.....79, 363, 492
xxvi. 1.....101
xxvi. 1-11.....196
xxvi. 3, sq.....196, 552
xxvi. 13.....181, 239
xxvi. 14-39.....197
xxvi. 23, sq.....195, 197
xxvi. 34.....342
xxvi. 35.....343
xxvi. 39.....163
xxvi. 41.....194
xxvi. 44.....197, 492
xxvii. 1-8.....293
xxvii. 1-25.....292
xxvii. 9.....268
xxvii. 11.....268
xxvii. 28.....267
xxvii. 32.....300
xxvii. 38.....292
xxviii. 26, sq.....298

NUMBERS. PAGES

i. 2.....225
i. 5, 6, 10.....113
i. 16.....223
i. 17.....94
i. 18.....225
i. 44.....223
i. 50.....206
i. 53.....204
ii. 17, sq.....385
iii. 3.....213
iii. 9.....204
iii. 11, sq.....203
iii. 24, 25.....206, 225
iii. 28.....206
iii. 30, 35.....225
iii. 38.....212
iii. 43, 46.....205
iv. 3.....206
iv. 5, sq.....254
iv. 7, 11.....256, 348
iv. 17, sq.....207
iv. 18.....226
iv. 30.....206
v. 2, sq.....168
v. 5-10.....301
v. 7.....248, 302
v. 8.....280
v. 9.....291
v. 11-31.....230, 320
v. 11.....222
v. 15.....267, 273, 320
v. 19, sq.....249
v. 22.....249
vi.....295
vi. 1-21.....294
vi. 2 5.....294
vi. 5.....292
vi. 7, 9.....286, 296
vi. 11.....296
vi. 12-16.....286, 287, 302, 304
vi. 14.....306
vi. 15, sq.....283
vi. 20.....290
vi. 24.....248
vi. 25, sq....128, 257, 290
vi. 27.....246
vii. 2.....223
vii. 3, sq.....262
vii. 16, 17....269, 289, 306
vii. 28, sq.....302
vii. 89.....254
viii. 5-22.....206
viii. 8.....305
viii. 10.....274
viii. 16.....203
viii. 19.....204, 227, 292
viii. 24.....206
ix. 7.....348
ix. 13.....325, 348
x. 8.....213
x. 9, sq.....336
x. 10.....213, 327
x. 21, 24.....385
x. 35.....200
xi. 4.....180, 244
xi. 5.....68
xi. 11.....216
xi. 16, sq....180, 221, 223
xi. 17, sq.....141
xi. 25, sq....141, 142, 364
xi. 29.....141, 142, 363, 508
xii. 1.....227
xii. 2.....364
xii. 6-8.....79, 142, 363, 478
xii. 7.....181
xii. 8.....111, 142, 143 541
xiii. 2, sq.....223

NUMBERS. PAGES

xiii. 13 446
xiii. 16 75
xiv. 75
xiv. 14 128
xiv. 17 101
xiv. 18 ..... 160, 162
xiv. 21, 28 ..... 101, 121, 496
xiv. 24 181
xiv. 33 456
xv. 273
xv. 3 284
xv. 8, sq 285
xv. 19, sq 291
xv. 24 ..... 306, 308
xv. 27 269
xv. 30 ..... 164. 301
xv. 32 ..... 330, 334
xv. 33 ..... 220, 221
xv. 35 ..... 22), 334
xv. 36 222
xv. 38, sq 182
xvi. 2 ..... 201, 223
xvi. 3, 7 ..... 200, 201
xvi. 9, 10 ..... 204, 205
xvi. 22 ..... 99, 119
xvi. 29 167
xvi. 26 256
xvi. 30 ..... 139, 170, 173
xvii. 4 252
xvii. 11 ..... 256, 277, 280
xvii. 16-24 257
xvii. 17 225
xvii. 21 298
xvii. 25 254
xviii. 1 209
xviii. 5 206
xviii. 6, 7 ..... 204, 206, 406
xviii. 8 212
xviii. 11, sq 291
xviii. 12 298
xviii. 15, 17 298
xviii. 16 232
xviii. 19 271
xviii. 20 ..... 212, 214
xviii. 21 300
xviii. 22, sq 304
xviii. 23, 30 207
xix. 168
xix. 7, 10 308
xix. 9, 17 319
xix. 11, sq 294
xix. 13, 20 232
xx. 10, 12 ..... 76, 77
xx. 14 76
xx. 24, 26 ..... 170, 215, 217
xx. 28 ..... 215, 357
xxi. 4 ..... 76, 151
xxi. 8, 9 ..... 78, 447
xxi. 14 ..... 200, 438
xxii. 22 448
xxii. 31, 38 ..... 132, 141
xxiii. 9 ..... 83, 179
xxiii. 10 ..... 172, 173
xxiii. 19, 21 ..... 113, 200
xxiii. 23 219
xxiii. 32 286
xxiv. 2 141
xxiv. 4, 15 ..... 91, 466, 476, 479
xxiv. 16 ..... 89, 476
xxiv. 17-19 ..... 76, 78, 224, 522
xxv. 3 114
xxv. 6-13 75
xxv. 11 74
xxv. 13 278
xxv. 44 244
xxvi 77, 226
xxvi. 29 72
xxvi. 41 154

NUMBERS. PAGES

xxvi. 55 ..... 122, 219
xxvii. 2 220
xxvii. 3 167
xxvii. 8-11 234
xxvii. 16 ..... 99, 223
xxvii. 18 141
xxvii. 21 218
xxviii 324, 326
xxviii. 2 324
xxviii. 3, 8 ..... 269, 285
xxviii. 9 ..... 286, 335
xxviii. 11 ..... 269, 336
xxviii. 15, 22 ..... 306, 310
xxviii. 16, 25 345
xxviii. 18 327
xxviii. 19, 24 346
xxviii. 27, sq 351
xxviii. 30 306
xxix 324, 326
xxix. 5, 7 ..... 306, 327
xxix. 12-34 351
xxix. 35 352
xxx. 3 ..... 292, 293
xxx. 4-10 226
xxx. 14 293
xxxi 79
xxxi. 14 220
xxxi. 16 ..... 77, 244
xxxi. 41, sq 291
xxxi. 50 262
xxxii 68, 77
xxxii. 12 181
xxxii. 13 75
xxxiii 74
xxxiii. 4 70
xxxiii. 19, sq 76
xxxiv. 1, sq 77
xxxiv. 17 80
xxxiv. 18, sq 223
xxxv. 6, 7 207
xxxv. 9-34 237
xxxv. 12 237
xxxv. 16 245
xxxv. 19 237
xxxv. 22, sq 164
xxxv. 23, 24 237
xxxv. 27 237
xxxv. 28 ..... 214, 237
xxxv. 30 221
xxxv. 31 ..... 238, 278
xxxv. 33 ..... 237, 238, 239, 278
xxxvi. 1 226
xxxvi. 11 234

DEUTERONOMY.

i. 5 46
i. 7 77
i. 12, sq 220
i. 13, 15 220
i. 16, sq 222
i. 17 ..... 219, 220
i. 32 459
i. 37 76
i. 39 156
i. 46 76
ii. 30 123
iii. 24 ..... 101, 139
iii. 25 83
iv. 1 196
iv. 3 489
iv. 6 539
iv. 6-8 ..... 18, 184
iv. 9 233
iv. 12, 13 ..... 139, 184
iv. 15, 19 ..... 111, 112, 186, 190, 440
iv. 20 179
iv. 29 ..... 153, 460
iv. 37 ..... 66, 128, 130
iv. 39 137

DEUTERONOMY.

PAGES

iv. 41, sq 237
iv. 42 300
v. 6-10 185
v. 8, 9 ..... 111, 162
v. 12 ..... 243, 324, 328
v. 14 240
v. 15 333
v. 18 187
v. 20 223
v. 23 ..... 100, 101
v. 26 184
v. 28, 29 ..... 162, 458
vi. 2 232
vi. 4 ..... 6, 30
vi. 5, 6 ..... 153, 183, 233
vi. 7 555
vi. 13 248
vi. 15 114
vi. 20, sq 233
vii. 3 227
vii. 6, 7 ..... 177, 179, 498
vii. 9 ..... 95, 197
viii. sq 492
viii. 1 196
viii. 2, sq 122, 123
viii. 2-5 73
viii. 5 ..... 153, 181
viii. 7-9 83
viii. 17 177
ix. 4-6 177
ix. 23 459
ix. 26 101
x. 4 184
x. 6 357
x. 8, 9 ..... 203, 207, 214
x. 14 112
x. 16 ..... 154, 183, 194
x. 17, 19 ..... 102, 240
x. 20, 22 ..... 84, 248
xi. 9 196
xi. 10 68
xi. 19 233
xii 251
xii. 5 125
xii. 5, 11 ..... 137, 250
xii. 6 ..... 288, 298
xii. 8 ..... 251, 356
xii. 12, 15 ..... 245, 251
xii. 17, sq 298
xii. 18 ..... 245, 291
xii. 19 209
xii. 23 152
xii. 31 267
xiii. 2, sq 139, 140, 478
xiii. 2-5, 6 ..... 143, 362
xiii. 3 ..... 64, 123
xiii. 6 ..... 220, 222
xiii. 16 293
xiii. 17 286
xiv 268
xiv. 1 ..... 135, 179, 293
xiv. 22, sq 247, 248, 298
xiv. 23 250
xiv. 27, 29 ..... 207, 338
xv. 1-11 338
xv. 1 341
xv. 4 ..... 236, 343
xv. 5 338
xv. 7-10 338
xv. 9 338
xv. 12 ..... 242, 343
xv. 12-18 ..... 241, 341
xv. 15 240
xv. 17 242
xv. 19, sq 298, 346
xv. 21, 22 ..... 251, 298
xvi 324
xvi. 1, 2 ..... 345, 346
xvi. 3 ..... 346, 349
xvi. 5-7 ..... 324, 345

DEUTERONOMY.

PAGES

xvi. 6, 8 ..... 285, 346
xvi. 10 288
xvi. 11. 233, 240, 291, 324, 351, 533
xvi. 11-14 245
xvi. 14, 15 ..... 233, 324
xvi. 16 ..233, 264, 314, 317
xvi. 17 ..... 221, 272 327
xvii. 3 440
xvii. 6, 7 ..... 220, 221
xvii. 8, sq 220, 404
xvii. 9, sq 204, 212
xvii. 12 ..... 205, 214
xvii. 14-20 224
xvii. 15 373
xvii. 16 224
xvii. 18, sq 204, 369
xviii. 1, sq 214
xviii. 3-5 204
xviii. 5 ..... 125, 205, 209
xviii. 6-8 ..... 204, 358
xviii. 7, 9 ..... 140, 205, 207
xviii. 9-22 ..... 362, 484
xviii. 11 171
xviii. 15-19 ..... 171, 522
xviii. 18 ..... 127, 362, 466
xviii. 19, sq 219
xviii. 22 486
xix. 1-13 237
xix. 8 322
xix. 12 ..... 220, 227, 322
xix. 17 ..... 219, 221
xix. 19, 21 ..... 221, 222
xx. 5, 8, 9 221
xx. 10 81
xx. 11 244
xx. 15, 16 ..... 81, 149
xx. 16 19 244
xxi. 1 9 ..... 279, 322
xxi. 2 220
xxi. 5 ..... 204, 205
xxi. 8 278
xxi. 10 245
xxi. 15 148
xxi. 15-17 234
xxi. 18 ..... 219, 223, 233
xxi. 19 220
xxi 20 245
xxi. 21, 23 ..... 220, 308
xxii 12 182
xxii. 15 220
xxii. 16, 18 ..... 221, 222
xxii. 19 231
xxii. 22 ..... 230, 232
xxii. 29 227
xxiii. 2 ..... 179, 293, 517
xxiii. 4 ..... 180, 516, 519
xxiii. 18 ..... 230, 292, 294
xxiii. 22 287
xxiii. 22-24 293
xxiii. 25, sq 344
xxiv 231
xxiv. 1, sq 231, 232
xxiv. 3, sq 231
xxiv. 3 506
xxiv. 10, 12 241
xxiv. 14 340
xxiv. 16 ..... 163, 238
xxiv. 18-22 240
xxv. 2, sq 222
xxv. 5-10 234
xxv. 7, 8 220
xxv. 18 341
xxvi. 1, 2 298
xxvi. 8 334
xxvi. 12, 13, 299, 300, 341
xxvi. 26 183
xxvii. 4-8 82
xxvii. 20, 22 228
xxvii. 23, sq 228

DEUTERONOMY.

PAGES

xxviii.-xxx. 79, 363, 414
xxviii. 1, sq. 196
xxviii. 9, sq. 516
xxviii. 10. 126
xxviii. 15, sq. 197
xxviii. 58. 92, 126
xxix. 10, 11. 244, 378
xxix. 13. 249
xxix. 25. 111, 112
xxx. 1, sq. 198
xxx. 1-6. 492
xxx. 2. 507
xxx. 6. 19, 21, 194, 457, 458
xxx. 11-20. 164, 184
xxx. 15, sq. 158, 196
xxx. 20. 196
xxxi. 2, 3. 338
xxxi. 9. 204, 207
xxxi. 10. 338, 341
xxxi. 11. 137, 247
xxxi. 10-13. 227, 233, 338
xxxi. 16, sq. 172, 184
xxxi. 17. 114
xxxi. 19, sq. 234
xxxi. 25. 207
xxxi. 26. 254, 258, 455
xxxi. 29. 489
xxxii. 79, 184, 234, 363
xxxii. 4. 112, 113
xxxii. 5. 135
xxxii. 6. 8. 58, 178
xxxii. 8. 89, 121, 148, 448
xxxii. 13. sq. 227
xxxii. 17, 18. 105, 117
xxxii. 21, sq. 114, 115, 170, 195
xxxii. 27. 505
xxxii. 36. sq. 115, 198
xxxii. 39. 112, 197, 512
xxxii. 40. 100, 101
xxxii. 42. 297
xxxii. 46. 233
xxxii. 50. 80
xxxiii. 202
xxxiii. 2. 442, 444
xxxiii. 5. 73, 199
xxxiii. 8. 66, 205
xxxiii. 9, sq. 74, 202
xxxiii. 10. 209, 216, 248, 285
xxxiii. 16. 297
xxxiii. 19. 452
xxxiii. 27-29. 196
xxxiii. 28. 83, 179
xxxiv. 5. 79, 173
xxxiv. 5-7. 80
xxxiv. 9. 141
xxxiv. 10. 363

JOSHUA.

i. 1-9. 81
i. 2-7. 181
i. 4. 77
iii. 3. 204
iii. 10, 13. 101, 102
iv. 2-12. 81
iv. 13, 14. 81
iv. 22-24. 81
v. 4, sq. 193
v. 6. 75
v. 10. 355
v. 11. 347
v. 14, sq. 120, 122, 440
vi. 2. 81, 130
vi. 5, 6. 207, 339
vii. 278
vii. 8. 102
vii. 14, sq. 122, 219, 225
viii. 81

JOSHUA. PAGES

viii. 30-35. 82
viii. 33. 221
ix. 361
ix. 19. 249
ix. 27. 376
x. 1-3. 63
x. 12, sq. 440
x. 40. 149
xi. 11-14. 149
xi. 16-23. 84
xi. 20. 81, 165
xii. 7, sq. 84
xiii. 2, sq. 83, 84
xiii-xxii. 84
xiv. 1. 80, 84, 219, 357
xiv. 2. 122
xiv. 8. 181
xiv. 10. 83
xv. 18. 227
xvi. 10. 357
xvii. 4. 80
xviii. 85
xviii. 1. 83, 84, 356
xviii. 4-9. 84
xix. 79, 202
xix. 1-9. 365
xix. 40. 386
xix. 51. 80, 356
xx. 252
xx. 4. 237
xxi. 4, 10. 207, 212
xxi. 11, 12. 208
xxi. 14, 16. 207, 208
xxi. 21, 24. 357
xxii. 5. 183
xxii. 14. 225
xxii. 19. 77
xxii. 22, 23. 87, 249
xxiii. 84
xxiii. 11. 183
xxiii. 15. 81
xxiv. 84
xxiv. 2. 58
xxiv. 14. 68, 525
xxiv. 15. 175, 349
xxiv. 19. 88, 114
xxiv. 23. 84
xxiv. 31. 84, 353

JUDGES.

i-iii. 354
i. 1. 81
i. 28. 244
i. 30. 244
i. 35. 357
ii. 1. 353, 364
ii. 1-5. 131
ii. 6. 353
ii. 7. 84
ii. 16-19. 354
ii. 16, 18. 362
ii. 22. 122
iii. 6. 353
iii. 9, 15. 362
iii. 31. 354
iv. 3. 354
iv. 4. 364
iv. 5. 354
iv. 6, 14. 364
v. 355
v. 4. 355, 358
v. 6. 552
v. 15-17. 354, 355
v. 20. 439
vi. 11, 14, 22. 131
vi. 12, sq. 359
vi. 15. 354
vi. 18. 356
vi. 19. 132
vi. 21. 282
vi. 21. 360

JUDGES. PAGES

vi. 32. 360
vi. 34. 141, 142
vii. 2. 354
vii. 13. 143
vii. 22. 503
viii. 1. 368
viii. 2, 3. 355
viii. 5, 20. 368
viii. 7. 368
viii. 23. 224, 369
viii. 27. 356
viii. 33. 359
ix. 361
ix. 4. 359
ix. 8, 15. 369
ix. 16. 368
ix. 21. 369
ix. 22. 368
ix. 46. 359
xi. 7. 364
xi. 10. 249
xi. 24. 103, 105
xi. 28-40. 359
xi. 29. 141
xi. 39. 360
xii. 1. 368
xiii. 4. 294
xiii. 16. 356
xiii. 18, 25. 132, 141, 142
xiv. 6, 19. 142
xiv. 12. 541
xv. 19. 150
xvi. 13. 297
xvii. 357
xvii. 5. 213, 359
xvii. 6. 356
xvii. 7. 357, 362
xviii. 14, 17. 359, 387
xviii. 30. 357
xviii. 31. 356
xix-xxi. 353
xix. 1. 357
xix. 5. 153
xix. 18. 357, 359
xix. 20. 175
xx. 12. 226
xx. 16. 160
xx. 26, 27. 356
xx. 26. 287, 356
xx. 28. 357
xx. 27. sq. 218, 353
xxi 3, 4, 6, 356, 509
xxi. 5-10. 360
xxi. 17. 201
xxi. 19. 355, 356
xxi. 19-21. 324
xxi. 21. 250

RUTH.

i. 20, sq. 91
ii. 4. 94
iv. 22. 370

1 SAMUEL.

i. sq. 356
i. 3. 356, 438
i. 6. 148
i. 11. 292, 294, 438
i. 13. 294
i. 20, 22. 195, 204
i. 28. 72, 204
ii. 2. 106
ii. 6. 512
ii. 12. 356
ii. 13-17. 357
ii. 15. 277
ii. 18. 359
ii. 22. 84, 292, 297, 360
ii. 27. 213, 364
ii. 28. 207, 252
iii. 1, 10. 364, 481

1 SAMUEL. PAGES

iii. 4. 129
iii. 14. 313
iv. 361
iv. 4. 254, 438
iv. 8. 89
iv. 21. 195
vi. 3, sq. 302, 304
vi. 4. 409
vi 6. 164, 165
vi. 9, 13. 122, 208
vi. 15. 358
vi. 20. 107
vii. 6. 293
vii. 9, sq. 261
vii. 10. 140
vii. 16. 355
viii. 2. 355
viii. 5, 11. 368, 369
viii. 20. 368
ix. 6. 100, 485, 486
ix. 8. 394
ix. 9. 364, 475, 486
ix. 13. 361
ix. 22. 368
x. 1. 369
x. 1-9. 369
x. 3. 361
x. 5-12. 365
x. 6. 141, 363, 482
x. 6-9. 369, 467, 474
x. 8. 370
x. 12. 366
x. 19-21. 226
x. 20. 219, 369
x. 25. 224
xi. 7. 175, 369
xi. 15-21. 361, 369
xii. 3. 218
xii. 11. 360
xiii. 8-14. 370
xiii. 9. 287
xiii. 19-22. 361
xiv. 18. 362
xiv. 24. 249
xiv. 41, sq. 122, 219
xiv. 41-2. 219
xiv. 52. 370
xv. 2. 438
xv. 11. 370
xv. 21. 361
xv. 22, sq. 370, 376, 452
xv. 27. 392
xv. 29. 113
xv. 29-35. 115
xv. 33. 267
xvi. 1. 370
xvi. 3, 5. 274, 368
xvi. 7. 369
xvi. 13. 141, 369
xvi. 14-23. 141, 142, 448
xvi. 15, 23. 448
xvii. 45. 438
xviii. 10. 141
xviii. 25. 227
xix. 18. 367
xix. 19, sq. 365, 367
xix. 24. 473, 474
xx. 4. 155
xx. 5, sq. 336
xx. 23. 554
xxi. 1-10. 361
xxii. 5. 367, 370
xxii. 10. 375
xxii. 17, sq. 361
xxii. 18. 213
xxiii. 9, sq. 218
xxiii. 25. 531
xxiv. 7. 369
xxv. 44. 231
xxvi. 9. 369
xxviii. 171

1 SAMUEL. PAGES

xxviii. 3 171
xxviii. 6 ... 142, 144, 486
xxviii. 9 370
xxviii. 13 89
xxviii. 15 171
xxix. 9 129
xxx. 7, sq 218
xxx. 17 286

2 SAMUEL.

i. 18 234
ii. 4 369
iii. 14 231
iii. 35 249
v. 2 ..... 371, 373
v. 3 369
vi 372
vi. 2 ..... 99, 254
vi. 17, 18 ..... 372, 374
vii 523
vii. 5–7 381
vii. 6 358
vii. 8, 18 ..... 369, 438
vii. 14 ..... 199, 374
vii. 16 373
vii. 23 ..... 89, 90
vii. 25 523
vii. 26 438
viii. 11 375
viii. 16, 17 ..... 374, 377
viii. 18 213
ix. 22 369
xi. 11 356
xi. 21 360
xii 371
xii. 13 ..... 463, 492
xii. 25 378
xiii. 13 228
xiv. 6-11 238
xv. 24, 34 ..... 208, 356
xvi. 11 123
xix. 11 369
xix. 41-43 385
xx 1, sq 385
xx. 23, 24 ... 213, 244, 374
xx. 25 375
xxi. 1 376
xxi. 3 280
xxi. 9 267
xxiii 524
xxiii. 1, 5 373
xxiii. 2 372
xxiv 123, 371, 409
xxiv. 1 448
xxiv. 11 374
xxiv. 15 451
xxiv. 18 ..... 252, 378
xxiv. 24 262
xxiv. 25 ..... 287, 357

1 KINGS.

i. 16 402
i. 39 369
ii. 4 196
ii. 10 172
ii. 19 402
ii. 25 213
ii. 27 382
ii. 37 166
iii. 2 252
iii. 4 374
iii. 5 143
iii. 12 ..... 537, 539
iii. 13, sq 388
iv. 2, sq 374
iv. 25 378
iv. 28 382
iv. 31 383
iv. 33 382
v. 5 378
v. 9 153

1 KINGS. PAGES

v. 12, sq 153, 382
v. 19 523
vi. 2 ..... 378, 380
vi. 4 379
vi. 21 380
vi. 29 259
vi. 31 380
vi. 36 379
vii. 13, sq 381
vii. 15 379
vii. 19, 23 379
vii. 29 259
viii 128, 381
viii. 2 ..... 324, 381
viii. 3, sq 207, 208
viii. 4 ..... 84, 381
viii. 11 ..... 110, 128
viii. 12, 13 .. 137, 255, 257, 379
viii. 14 374
viii. 20 378
viii. 27, 29 128
viii. 30 137
viii. 31, sq .. 221, 219, 250
viii. 32, 35 137
viii. 38 137
viii. 39, 43 137
viii. 41 382
viii. 42 126
viii. 46 165
viii. 55 374
viii. 62, sq 374
viii. 65 ..... 317, 381
viii. 66 381
ix. 3 250
ix. 15, sq 384
ix. 20 244
ix. 25 ..... 374, 382
ix. 26 384
x. 1 ..... 383, 511
x. 5 ..... 150, 182
x. 11, 12 384
xi. 4, sq 384
xi. 13, 32 ..... 384, 385
xi. 27, 29 384
xi. 36 385
xi. 39 ..... 386, 523
xi. 21, 22 385
xii. 23 386
xii. 28 ..... 89, 388
xii. 31, 32 388
xiii. 11, sq 388
xiii. 16, sq 394
xiii. 20, sq 394
xiii. 33 388
xiii. 38 282
xiv. 1, sq 485
xiv. 3 394
xiv. 6, 7 ..... 388, 486
xiv. 16 486
xiv. 17 387
xiv. 21 402
xiv. 25, sq 403
xv. 2, 13 402
xv. 17, 21 ..... 385, 387
xvi. 1, 7 ..... 388, 394
xvi. 22 387
xvi. 24 390
xvi. 28 172
xvi. 32 390
xvii. 21, sq .. 169, 171, 172
xvii. 24 100
xviii. 19 ..... 390, 391
xviii. 21, 22 390
xviii. 46 390
xix. 3 385
xix. 4, 14 ..... 150, 389
xix. 11, sq 129
xix. 16 393
xix. 18 507
xix. 19 392

1 KINGS. PAGES

xx. 13, 28 391
xx. 34 390
xx. 35 ..... 392, 394
xx. 38, 41 394
xxi 220
xxi. 1 390
xxi. 3 ..... 235, 343
xxi. 5 151
xxi. 21-29 393
xxi. 28, sq 413, 492
xxii 391, 393
xxii. 7, 24 391
xxii. 19 ..... 441, 449
xxii. 21 142
xxii. 28 407

2 KINGS.

i. 3 485
i. 7 392
ii. 3–5 392
ii. 9, 10 ..... 142, 393
ii. 15 394
ii. 7, 16, sq 392
ii. 25 392
iii. 15 ..... 366, 475
iv. 1 241
iv. 8, sq 393
iv. 23 ..... 335, 393
iv. 25 392
iv. 34, sq 169, 171, 172
iv. 38, sq 392
iv. 42 393
iv. 43 391
v. 7 319
v. 9 392
v. 20-27 394
v. 26 ..... 155, 394
vi. 1, sq 392
vi. 16 442
vi. 32 392
viii. 18 404
ix 393
ix. 4 ..... 392, 394
ix. 11 ..... 393, 473
ix. 12 369
ix. 15 390
x. 11, 13 ..... 396, 402
x. 15, 23 393
x. 20 352
x. 30 395
xi. 404
xi. 4–12 406
xi. 12 369
xi. 18 ..... 404, 406
xii. 3 402
xii. 5 299
xiii. 6 395
xiii. 14, sq 395
xiv. 6 ..... 163, 238
xiv. 8–14 405
xiv. 25 395
xv. 3, 34 405
xv. 10 398
xv. 13, sq 396
xv. 19 396
xv. 29 397
xvi. 3, sq 408
xvi. 3 413
xvi. 5, sq 410
xvi. 6, 7 408
xvi. 10 ..... 410, 413
xvii. 2 397
xvii. 3 398
xvii. 7–23 398
xvii. 16 413
xvii. 24, 25 399
xvii. 29 226
xvii. 31 413
xviii 409
xviii 4 ..... 78, 410
xviii. 5-9 ..... 398, 412

2 KINGS. PAGES

xviii. 13, sq 409
xviii. 17, sq 409
xix. 8, sq 411
xix. 9 409
xix. 35, sq 412
xx 412
xx. 12, sq 410
xxi. 3, 7 412
xxi. 5 ..... 379, 413
xxi. 10, 16 413
xxii 415
xxii. 3 415
xxii. 11, 12 ..... 414, 421
xxii. 14 401
xxii. 20 513
xxiii. 4 511
xxiii. 5 413
xxiii. 8 413
xxiii. 10 413
xxiii. 11 ..... 381, 413
xxiii. 12 413
xxiii. 13 ..... 384, 410
xxiii. 22 ..... 47, 415
xxiii. 26 413
xxiii. 29 417
xxiii. 30, 31, 364, 402, 417
xxiii. 34 97
xxiv. 1 418
xxiv. 3 413
xxiv. 7 417
xxiv. 8–17 418
xxiv. 10-16 421
xxiv. 17 97
xxv 1–7 ..... 420, 423
xxv. 3 423
xxv. 8 420
xxv. 16 379
xxv. 18 217
xxv. 25 ..... 421, 423
xxv. 27, sq 425

1 CHRONICLES.

ii. 34 245
ii. 53 85
ii. 55 393
iii. 19 426
iii. 24 195
iv. 14 85
iv. 28-32 84
iv. 36 195
v. 2 ..... 66, 234
v. 26 398
v. 29 357
vi. 7 362
vi. 9 439
vi. 13, 18 362
vi. 16 375
vi. 34 207
vi. 35 357
vi. 39 212
vi. 39-66 84
vi. 46 208
vii. 7, 40 225
vii. 8 195
vii. 11 226
vii. 22 72
viii. 10 226
ix. 2, 14 ..... 376, 377
ix. 19 376
x. 13 172
xii. 6, 9 362
xii. 18 142
xiii. 2 375
xiii. 3 361
xv 375
xv. 16 375
xv. 17 383
xv. 18-23 362
xvi. 37 376
xvi. 39 375
xvii. 7, 24 439

1 CHRONICLES.

PAGES

xvii. 9, 11.....523
xvii. 14.....372
xviii. 16.. 377
xxi.....311
xxi. 1 .....448, 449
xxi. 9.....374
xxi. 15.....451
xxi. 23.....85
xxi. 26.....282
xxii. 375
xxii. 8.....372
xxiii. 4 221
xxiii. 11.....226
xxiii. 25.....376, 377
xxiv. 3, 6.....377
xxv. 2, 5.. 367
xxvi. 29.....376
xxvii. 5.....213
xxvii. 32.....374
xxviii. 2.....257
xxviii. 3.....372
xxviii. 5.....372
xxviii. 9.....162
xxviii. 18.....259
xxviii. 19 380
xxix. 5.....213
xxix. 10.....374
xxix. 23.....372
xxix. 29.....367

2 CHRONICLES.

i. 6 374
ii. 7.....244
ii. 13.....381
ii. 45.....380
iii. 2, 9 378
iii. 4, 14.....379, 80
iv. 8.....380
iv. 9.....379
v. 3.....381
vii. 1.....282
vii. 8.....324
vii. 9.....317
vii. 9, 10.....381
vii. 16.....250
viii. 7.....241
viii. 13.....324
viii. 14.....375, 376
x. 23.....384
xi. 2, 3.....384
xi. 10.....386
xi. 13.....388
xi. 21.....402
xii. 5.....404
xiii.....403
xiii. 5.....271
xiii. 9.....388, 389
xiii. 12.....213
xiii. 14.....336
xiv. 7.....384
xv. 1.....403
xv. 9.....384, 386
xvi. 7 403
xvii. 7-9.....403
xix. 2 404
xix 5-11.....403, 404
xix. 34.....410
xx.....504
xx. 14.....404
xx. 20.....459, 460
xx. 22.....503
xx. 34.....367
xx. 37.....404
xxi. 2, 4, 11.....404
xxi. 3.....402
xxi. 4.....405
xxi. 8-10.....504
xxi. 17.....377, 404
xxii. 1.....404

2 CHRONICLES.

PAGES

xxiii.....404
xxiii. 1, 11, 18.....406
xxiv. 1.....418
xxiv. 6 11.....299
xxiv. 20.....142
xxiv. 22.....239
xxv 406
xxv. 17 405
xxvi. 4.....375
xxvi. 5.....406
xxvi. 22 308
xxviii. 2, sq.....408
xxviii. 5 sq.....408, 410
xxviii. 9-15.....398
xxviii. 11.....378
xxviii. 17.....408, 410
xxviii. 18.....386
xxviii. 23.....408
xxix 410
xxix. 22-24.....275, 276
xxix. 25.....375
xxix. 27.....286
xxix. 30.....367. 412
xxix. 31.....213
xxix.-xxxii.....409, 410
xxx 399, 410
xxx. 2 325
xxx. 16.....346
xxx. 30.....47, 342
xxxi.....411
xxxi. 2.....376
xxxi. 3.....324
xxxii. 410
xxxii. 3-6.....411
xxxii. 11.....412
xxxii. 23 412
xxxii. 31.....123
xxxii. 32.....367
xxxiii. 6.....413
xxxiii. 11.....412
xxxiv 414, 415
xxxiv. 9 399
xxxv. 4, sq.....375
xxv. 7-9.....346, 347
xxxv. 11, 12.....346
xxxv. 15.....367
xxxv. 18.....47, 342
xxxv. 21.....416
xxxv. 20-25.....417
xxxv. 27.....415
xxxvi. 1-4 417
xxxvi. 6, 7 .....418, 419
xxxvi. 9, sq.....419
xxxvi. 13, ...164, 419
xxxvi. 14.....375
xxxvi. 21 .....47, 342, 422
xxxvi. 22, sq.....424

EZRA.

i. 1 424
i. 2.....426
i. 4, 7.....424
i. 8 425
ii. 2 426
ii. 43, 58.....376
ii. 59.....426
ii. 62.....212
ii. 63 435
ii. 64.....244, 425
ii. 68, sq 425
ii. 70 433
iii. 2.....425, 426
iii. 3-10 425
iii. 6.....425
iii. 7-9.....425
iii. 8.....377
iv. 1-5 426
iv. 2, 9 399
iv. 5 427

EZRA.

PAGES

iv. 6 428
iv. 6-23 427
iv. 7, sq 430
iv. 7-23 429
iv. 27, 29.....399
v. 1.....427, 428
v. 41.....425
vi. 4, 8.....424
vi. 9 272
vi. 14 428
vi. 17 425
vi. 20 346
vi. 21 426
vii 428
vii. 1, sq.....357
vii. 5 217
vii. 6, 10 434
vii. 7 429
vii. 11 429
vii. 17, 22 272
vii. 24 376
vii. 14, 25.....433, 435
viii 429
viii. 8.....446
viii 15.....429
viii. 20.....376
viii. 35.....357, 426
ix. 2.....304
x. 2, 10 304
x. 5.....375
x. 16.....435
x. 18 .....213, 304
x. 18-22 434,

NEHEMIAH.

i 429
i. 3.....429, 430
ii. 10, 19 431
iii. 29.....436
v. 2 .....431, 433
v. 5 .....241, 431
v. 8. 241
v. 15.....428
v. 6-13.....431
vi. 6 14 432
vi. 17 431
vii.....431
vii. 7 426
vii. 60 376
vii. 64 212
vii. 66.....244, 425
vii. 70-72.....425
vii. 73.....433
viii. 1.....425, 431
viii. 5.....431
viii. 7, 13.....435
viii. 9 12.....425
viii. 17.....47, 415
ix. 1.....431
ix. 6.....438, 439
ix. 14.....328
ix. 20.....141
ix. 36.....431
x. 1.....435
x. 29.....378, 426
x. 31 335
x. 32 344
x. 33 272
x. 35, sq.....433
xi. 3.....376, 433
xi. 25 sq.....430
xii. 7.....375
xii. 44, 47.....377, 433
xiii. 4.....431
xiii. 5.....377
xiii. 6.....432
xiii. 13.....436
xiii. 15, 19.....335
xiii. 26 431
xiii. 28.....213, 431, 434

ESTHER.

PAGES

iii. 7 430
iv. 13.....155
ix. 24-26.....430

JOB.

i. sq....442, 449, 450, 562
i. 5.....263
i. 6.....135
i. 21.....151, 152
ii. 1.....135
ii. 6 449
iii. 13, 19.....173
iii. 17.....160, 173
iii. 17-19.....173
iv. sq.....562
iv. 12-15.....173, 562
iv. 15.....169, 172
iv. 17, sq.....158
v. 1 442
v. 27.....538
vi. 10.....111
vi. 13 550
vii 557
vii. 7, sq.....564
vii. 9.....171
vii. 21. 171
viii 561
viii. 8, sq.....538
ix. 9.....440
ix. 13.....440, 544
ix. 21.....177
ix. 27.....154
x. 20, 22.....170, 564
xi. 7, sq.....544
xii. 6.....55
xii. 7-12.....538
xii. 10.....119, 150, 152
xiii 470
xiv.....557, 564
xiv. 4.....158, 162
xiv. 5.....119
xiv. 8.....530
xiv. 10, 12.....171
xiv. 14, 15.....564
xiv. 22.....169
xv. 7, sq.....543
xv. 20-35.....561
xvi. 18, sq.....238, 564
xvii. 1.....150
xviii 561
xix. 25.....237
xix. 25-27.....564
xx 561
xxi. 4 151
xxii. 6 474
xxiv. 7, 10.....474
xxiv. 9. 241
xxv. 5 440
xxvi. 5.....171
xxvi. 6.....170, 172
xxvi. 12, sq.....544
xxvi. 13.....440
xxvii. 2.....151
xxvii. 3.....119
xxvii. 5, sq.....556
xxvii. 6.....153
xxvii. 11 561
xxviii.....543, 561
xxviii. 12, sq.....542
xxviii. 28, sq.....542
xxviii. 25-27.....542
xxviii. 28 .....102, 546
xxix. 7-11.....383
xxix. 21-25.....383
xxx. 23.....170
xxx. 28.....463
xxxi.....543, 556
xxxi. 7.....154
xxxi. 13-15.....245
xxxi. 26-28.....413, 440
xxxi. 33.....160

JOB. PAGES

xxxi. 38 ... 344
xxxi. 39 ... 152
xxxii. 8 ... 150
xxxiii. 4 ... 119, 150
xxxiii. 14, sq ... 480
xxxiii. 14–29 ... 562
xxxiii. 15, sq ... 143
xxxiii. 22 ... 450
xxxiii. 23 ... 442, 450
xxxiii. 24 ... 278, 442
xxxiii. 26 ... 461
xxxiii. 28 ... 463
xxxiv. 10 ... 253, 562
xxxiv. 14, sq ... 169
xxxiv. 37 ... 160, 161
xxxv. 10 ... 88
xxxvi. 5–15 ... 562
xxxvi. 14 ... 172
xxxvi. 22 ... 563
xxxvii. 12, sq ... 544
xxxvii. 21, sq ... 563
xxxviii ... 564
xxxviii. 4–7 ... 117, 135, 439, 544
xxxviii. 10 ... 119
xxxviii. 11 ... 544
xxxviii. 28, sq ... 117
xxxviii. 31, sq ... 440
xxxviii. 33 ... 544
xxxviii. 41 ... 122
xxxix–xli ... 382
xl ... 562
xli. 13 ... 152
xlii. 7 ... 537
xlii. 8 ... 263

PSALMS.

i. 6 ... 177
ii ... 371, 524
ii. 2 ... 522, 524
ii. 4 ... 123, 138
ii. 7 ... 374
ii. 8 ... 373
iii ... 558
iii. 5 ... 137, 372
iv. 5 ... 455, 558
iv. 8, sq ... 559
v. 5 ... 111, 558
vi. 4 ... 151, 154
vi. 6 ... 558
vii ... 558
vii. 4 ... 287
vii. 10 ... 155
viii. 2 ... 125
viii. 4 ... 440
viii. 6 ... 90, 146, 147
viii. 7–9 ... 146
ix ... 558
ix. 13 ... 237
ix. 18 ... 15, 16
x. 1, 13 ... 557
x. 4, sq ... 556
x. 16 ... 199
xi. 4 ... 137, 441, 442
xii ... 557
xiii. 3 ... 155
xiv ... 538, 557
xiv. 1 ... 538, 556
xiv. 3 ... 30
xv ... 376, 452
xv. 4 ... 250
xvi ... 559
xvi. 2 ... 92
xvi. 5 ... 212
xvi. 7 ... 480
xvi. 9 ... 151
xvi. 10 ... 150, 169, 559
xvii ... 560
xvii. 1, sq ... 556
xvii. 3 ... 155
xvii. 15 ... 559

PSALMS. PAGES

xviii. 1 ... 549
xviii. 7 ... 137
xviii. 11 ... 259, 260
xviii. 21, sq ... 5, 6
xviii. 25, 26 ... 115, 195
xviii. 44, 48 ... 371, 373
xix ... 462
xix. 2, sq ... 16
xix. 5, 7, sq ... 440, 540
xix. 8, sq ... 153, 455, 539
xix. 13 ... 461
xx. 2 ... 127
xx. 3 ... 372
xx. 6, 7 ... 369, 481
xxi. 3 ... 155
xxi. 4, 6 ... 374
xxi. 5, 7 ... 524
xxi. 10 ... 128
xxii ... 531, 562
xxii. 4, 7 ... 107, 533
xxii. 15 ... 153
xxii. 23 ... 532
xxii. 29 ... 561
xxiii. 3 ... 127
xxiv ... 375, 438
xxiv. 4 ... 189
xxiv. 4–6 ... 452
xxiv. 6 ... 180, 517
xxiv. 7, sq ... 199
xxiv. 10 ... 438, 443
xxv. 11 ... 127
xxv. 14 ... 547
xxvi. 7, sq ... 452
xxvii. 3 ... 551
xxvii. 4 ... 248, 452
xxvii. 14 ... 154
xxviii. 1 ... 172
xxviii. 4, 6 ... 540
xxviii. 10 ... 369
xxix. 1 ... 136, 441, 442
xxix. 5 ... 443
xxix. 9 ... 137, 441
xxix. 27, sq ... 374
xxx. 4 ... 150, 169, 173
xxx. 9 ... 558
xxxi. 4 ... 127
xxxi. 6 ... 113
xxxi. 25 ... 154
xxxii ... 462, 547
xxxii. 2 ... 161
xxxii. 5 ... 160
xxxii. 6 ... 480
xxxiii. 6 ... 118, 439
xxxiii. 9 ... 116, 120
xxxiii. 21 ... 107
xxxiv ... 441, 462, 541
xxxiv. 7 ... 443
xxxiv. 21 ... 349
xxxv. 17 ... 557
xxxvi. 6, 7 ... 113
xxxvi. 9, 10 .. 101, 118, 257
xxxvii. 18 ... 177
xxxvii. 31 ... 455
xxxix. 4 ... 156
xxxix. 14 ... 171
xl. 7, 8 ... 303, 452, 456
xl. 15 ... 560
xlii. sq ... 452
xlii. 2, sq ... 153
xlii. 3 ... 101, 137
xlii. 6 ... 154, 460
xlii. 12 ... 151
xliv. 2 ... 233
xliv. 5 ... 200
xliv. 6 ... 127
xlv ... 524
xlvi ... 409
xlvi. 5 ... 30, 372
xlvi. 7, 11 ... 443
xlvi. 10, sq ... 521
xlvii ... 403

PSALMS. PAGES

xlviii ... 403
xlviii. 3 ... 199
xlviii. 14 ... 559, 560
xlix. 3 ... 541
xlix. 3, 14 ... 560
xlix. 15 ... 560
xlix. 20 ... 169
l ... 376, 452
l. 1 ... 87
l. 5 ... 264
l. 12, sq ... 112
l. 14 ... 293
l. 16, sq ... 467
l. 21 ... 461
li ... 462
li. 6 ... 123, 547
li. 7 ... 162
li. 10, 12 ... 153, 456
li. 12 ... 456
li. 13 ... 110, 141, 142
li. 18 ... 288, 452
li. 19 ... 462
li. 20 ... 452
li. 21 ... 285
liv. 3 ... 126
liv. 8 ... 288
lv. 16 ... 173
lv. 17 ... 454
lvi. 13 ... 287, 288
lvii. 3 ... 89
lix ... 558
lix. 5 ... 439
lx ... 428
lx. 1 ... 234
lx. 3 ... 449
lxi. 7 ... 524
lxii. 2 ... 154
lxii. 6 ... 460
lxiii ... 452
lxiii. 3 ... 137, 559
lxiii. 4 ... 196
lxv. 2, 6 ... 122
lxvi. 13–15 ... 293
lxvi. 18 ... 154, 293
lxviii ... 470
lxviii. 15 ... 91
lxviii. 17 ... 442
lxviii. 20 ... 559
lxviii. 22 ... 297
lxviii. 25 ... 200
lxviii. 26, sq ... 377
lxix. 9 ... 558, 560
lxix. 10 ... 558
lxix. 31 ... 99
lxxi. 7 ... 139
lxxii ... 524
lxxii. 8 ... 373
lxxii. 9, 17 ... 321, 524
lxxiii ... 560
lxxiii. 5 ... 135
lxxiii. 7 ... 153
lxxiii. 13 ... 559
lxxiii. 15 ... 135, 180, 463
lxxiii. 23–25 ... 549, 560
lxxiii. 26, 27 .. 154, 456, 458, 459, 560
lxxiv ... 428
lxxiv. 2 ... 372
lxxiv. 9 ... 363, 466, 480
lxxiv. 12 ... 199
lxxv ... 409
lxxv. 2 ... 127
lxxv. 8 ... 99, 449
lxxvi. 2 ... 97
lxxvi. 3 ... 372
lxxvi. 12 ... 412
lxxvii. 14, sq ... 107, 140
lxxvii. 14–16 ... 73
lxxvii. 17–21 ... 71
lxxvii. 39 ... 167
lxxviii ... 75, 541

PSALMS. PAGES

lxxviii. 2 ... 541
lxxviii. 3–6 ... 233
lxxviii. 25 ... 445
lxxviii. 43 sq ... 70
lxxviii. 49 ... 451
lxxviii. 58, sq ... 114
lxxviii. 60 ... 356
lxxviii. 68 ... 372
lxxviii. 70, 72 ... 369, 371
lxxix ... 428
lxxix. 6, sq ... 497
lxxix. 9 ... 462
lxxx ... 386
lxxx. 1 ... 260
lxxx. 4, 7 ... 439, 443
lxxx. 14, 19 ... 439, 443
lxxxi. 11, 12 ... 165, 166, 443
lxxxii ... 90
lxxxii. 7 ... 161
lxxxiii. 10, 12 ... 355
lxxxiv ... 452
lxxxiv. 3 ... 101, 151, 155
lxxxiv. 8 ... 439
lxxxv ... 428
lxxxvi. 13 ... 169, 170
lxxxvii ... 372, 491, 518, 525
lxxxvii. 1 ... 372, 381
lxxxvii. 3, sq ... 520
lxxxviii ... 560
lxxxviii. 5 ... 171
lxxxviii. 7 ... 170, 172
lxxxviii. 11, 12 ... 171, 558
lxxxviii. 13 ... 171
lxxxix ... 428
lxxxix. 4 ... 176
lxxxix. 6 8 ... 441
lxxxix. 7 ... 135
lxxxix. 20–28 ... 373
lxxxix. 30, sq ... 523
lxxxix. 37, sq ... 523
lxxxix. 39, 51 ... 369, 373
lxxxix. 48, sq ... 168
lxxxix. 49 ... 169
lxxxix. 50 ... 373
xc ... 524, 558
xc. 1, sq ... 100
xc. 2 ... 117
xc. 3 ... 561
xc. 4 ... 100
xc. 7–9 ... 557
xc. 7–10 ... 167
xci. 1 ... 91
xci. 11 ... 441, 448
xcii ... 334
xcii. 5 ... 540
xciii. 1 ... 517
xciv. 8–10 ... 15, 16, 146
xciv. 17 ... 169, 171
xcv. 8, sq ... 75, 164
xcvi.–xcviii ... 525
xcvi. 10 ... 517
xcvi.–xcix ... 425
xcvii ... 525
xcvii. 1 ... 517
xcviii. 7 ... 90
xcviii ... 525
xcviii. 7, sq ... 521
xcix. 1 ... 254
xcix. 2–5 ... 106
xcix. 5 ... 257
c. 3 ... 178
ci ... 372
ci. 4 ... 153
ci. 5 ... 155
cii ... 426
cii. 5 ... 153
cii. 13, 14 ... 426
cii. 26, sq ... 117, 440
cii. 27, sq ... 120, 512

PSALMS. PAGES

cii. 28, sq.....100, 199
ciii. 462
ciii. 1, sq... 107, 109, 127
ciii. 10, 14..... 158, 168
ciii. 15–18 557
ciii. 19 138
ciii. 20, 21...441, 444, 445
civ. 118, 544
civ. 2.. 120
civ. 4..... 135, 136, 441
civ. 15..... 153
civ. 19, sq.....325, 440
civ. 24..... 540
civ. 27.....122, 342
civ. 28..... 121
civ. 29, sq..120, 140, 149, 169
civ. 30..... 117
civ. 31 ..... 110, 121
civ. 35 ..... 121, 554
cv. 3..... 107
cv. 15..... 364, 521
cvi. 16..... 214
cvi. 18..... 288
cvi. 23..... 532
cvi. 28..... 101
cvi. 32, sq..... 76, 77
cvi. 37..... 91
cvii. 24..... 140
cix..... 558
cix. 6..... 448
cix. 21..... 127
cix. 29..... 448
cx..... 524, 525
cx. 2..... 372
cx. 4..... 61, 216
cxi. 9, 10..... 126, 546
cxii. 7, sq..... 459
cxiii.-cxviii..... 347
cxiv..... 71, 346
cxv.-cxviii..... 346
cxv. 1..... 127
cxv. 3..... 540
cxv. 4, sq..... 498
cxv. 10..... 310
cxv. 17..... 171
cxvi. 7..... 154
cxviii..... 346
cxviii. 3..... 310
cxix..... 455, 539
cxix. 18..... 322, 540
cxix. 20..... 155
cxix. 32..... 155
cxix. 70..... 165
cxix. 81..... 155
cxx.-cxxxiv..... 377
cxxi. 2..... 117
cxxiv. 8..... 127
cxxv. 1, sq..... 372, 374
cxxvii. 3, sq..... 148
cxxviii. 3, sq..... 148
cxxx. 3–5..... 457, 460
cxxx. 4..... 461
cxxx. 7..... 462
cxxxi. 2..... 154
cxxxii. 6..... 261
cxxxii. 7..... 257
cxxxii. 11, sq..... 523
cxxxiii. 2..... 216
cxxxv. 6..... 116, 540
cxxxv. 19..... 310
cxxxvi..... 347
cxxxvii..... 423
cxxxvii. 4–6..... 424
cxxxvii. 7..... 420
cxxxviii. 1..... 90
cxxxix..... 112, 540
cxxxix. 4..... 479
cxxxix. 6..... 117
cxxxix. 7... 128, 441, 479
cxxxix. 8..... 172

PSALMS. PAGES

cxxxix. 14..... 140, 155
cxxxix. 15..... 151
cxxxix. 17, 21... 540, 558
cxxxix. 23, sq..... 547
cxli. 2..... 156, 273, 274
cxli. 7..... 561
cxlii. 5 551
cxliii. 2..... 165
cxliii. 4, 11..... 127
cxliii. 10.....141, 456
cxlv. 9..... 121
cxlv. 15, sq..... 121
cxlv. 16..... 342
cxlvi. 4..... 149, 171
cxlvii. 9..... 122
cxlvii. 15–18 120
cxlvii. 15..... 540
cxlvii. 18, sq..... 128
cxlvii. 19, sq....184, 539, 540
cxlviii..... 544
cxlviii. 2..... 441
cxlviii. 6..... 119, 120
cxlviii. 8..... 540
cl. 1..... 441
cl. 6..... 150

PROVERBS.

i. 2..... 545
i. 3..... 545
i. 4..... 546
i. 5..... 549
i. 6..... 382, 383, 541
i. 7..... 545, 546
i. 8..... 555
i. 12..... 170, 172
i. 20..... 383, 546
i. 22..... 545
i. 23 545
i. 24, sq..... 546
ii. 1–9..... 555
ii. 6..... 551
ii. 7..... 550
ii. 12, sq..... 553
ii. 17..... 553
ii. 18..... 171, 551
ii. 21..... 551
iii. 5, 7..... 547
iii. 6..... 547, 549
iii. 11..... 545, 554
iii. 15 552
iii. 18..... 551
iii. 19, sq..... 541
iii. 21..... 550
iii. 32..... 547
iv. 3..... 555
iv. 13..... 545
iv. 23..... 153, 548
v..... 553
v. 5..... 551
v. 12..... 546
vi. 1–4..... 549
vi. 6–11..... 555
vi. 18..... 548
vi. 20, sq..... 555
vi. 25..... 154, 189
vi. 23, sq..... 553
vi. 35..... 278
vii..... 542
vii. 5, sq..... 555
vii. 27..... 551
viii..... 543
viii. 13..... 547
viii. 14..... 550
viii. 15, sq..... 369
viii. 16..... 545
viii. 22..... 30, 542
viii. 27–31..... 542
viii. 35..... 196, 550
ix. 1, sq 545
ix. 10..... 88, 546

PROVERBS. PAGES

ix. 18..... 551
x. 1..... 553
x.-xxii..... 541
x. 7..... 551
x. 8..... 153
x. 10 549
x. 12..... 549
x. 17..... 545, 546
x. 25..... 549
x. 26..... 555
x. 30..... 551, 552
xi. 4..... 552
xi. 7..... 551, 552
xi. 8....278, 497, 499, 551
xi. 12..... 549
xi. 14..... 553
xi. 15, 17... 549
xi. 16, 22..... 556
xi. 19..... 550
xi. 28..... 552
xii. 1..... 546
xii. 4..... 148, 553, 556
xii. 15..... 547
xii. 25..... 154
xii. 28..... 196, 551
xiii. 2 154
xiii. 8..... 278
xiii. 9..... 550
xiii. 14..... 550
xiii. 18 546
xiii. 20..... 383
xiii. 21... 550
xiii. 24..... 545
xiii. 25..... 555
xiv. 10..... 155
xiv. 15..... 549
xiv. 29..... 549
xiv. 31..... ... 549
xiv. 32..... 551
xiv. 34..... 553
xv. 1..... 549
xv. 5..... ... 546
xv. 6..... 552
xv. 8..... 548
xv. 11.....170, 172, 547
xv. 12..... 383
xv. 16 552
xv. 18..... 549
xv. 19..... 555
xv. 24.....170, 551
xvi. 2 547
xvi. 4 ..... 123, 554
xvi. 12–15 553
xvi. 16..... 552
xvi. 33 122
xvii. 3..... 155, 548
xvii. 6 554
xvii. 10 551
xvii. 14 549
xvii. 21..... 553
xviii. 10, 18..... 126, 219
xviii. 21..... 549
xviii. 22..... 549, 553
xviii. 26..... 549
xix. 2..... 155
xix. 14..... 148, 553
xix. 15, 24..... 555
xix. 20, 21 ..... 545, 550
xix. 25 555
xx. 3..... 549
xx. 4, 13..... 555
xx. 8..... 553
xx. 9 ..... 166, 548
xx. 11, 20..... 555
xx. 25..... 293
xx. 26..... 553
xx. 27..... 150, 153, 527
xx. 30..... 555
xxi. 3 548
xxi. 4 155
xxi. 16 171

PROVERBS. PAGES

xxi. 18.....278, 497, 499
xxi. 24 384
xxi. 27..... 548
xxii. 7..... 241
xxii. 15, 17 ..... 382, 545, 555
xxii. 22..... 549
xxiii. 12 555
xxiii. 13–16..... 169
xxiii. 14..... 555
xxiii. 19–21..... 555
xxiii. 23..... 545
xxiii. 24 .. .. 553, 554
xxiii. 26–28 555
xxiv. 23..... 382
xxv. sq..... 556
xxv. 1..... 383
xxv. 5 553
xxv. 21, sq..... ... 549
xxv. 23..... ... 117
xxv. 30..... ... 546
xxvi. 13–16... ... 555
xxvii. 11..... 553
xxvii. 20, 23..... 170, 177
xxviii. 7..... 554
xxviii. 12, 15 553
xxviii. 13..... 462, 548
xxviii. 14..... 164, 547
xxviii. 25 155
xxix. 3..... 554
xxix. 4..... 553
xxix. 12, 14..... 553
xxix. 15, 17..... 555
xxix. 18..... 553
xxix. 19–21..... 245
xxix. 24..... 249
xxx..... 556
xxx. 1–5..... 538, 543
xxx. 9..... 127
xxx. 7–9 ..... 552, 553
xxx. 15, sq..... 541
xxx. 16..... 170
xxx. 17 555
xxx. 18–20 541
xxx. 21–23..... 541
xxx. 29–31..... 541
xxxi..... 556
xxxi. 1–9..... 554
xxxi. 10, 30 .143, 553, 556
xxxi. 10–13..... 541

ECCLESIASTES.

i. 3..... 565
ii. 12, sq..... 566
ii. 13, sq..... 566
ii. 26..... 537
iii. 11, 14 566
iii. 12..... 568
iii. 13..... 568
iii. 16, sq..... 566
iii. 18–21..... 169
iii. 19, 21..... 567
iv. 17..... (see § 241)
v. 1..... 548
v. 3, 7.. 143
v. 3–5..... 293
vii. 2–4 568
vii. 9..... 154
vii. 14..... 568
vii. 16–18..... 568
vii. 20... .. 166, 430, 548
vii. 29..... 156
viii. 12..... 566
ix. 4–6..... 567
ix. 5..... 173, 567
ix. 10..... 567
x. 16..... 402
xi. 4–6..... 568
xi. 9. sq..... 567, 569
xii. 1..... 88
xii. 6, 7..... 155, 169, 567

ECCLESIASTES.

PAGES
xii. 11 541
xii. 14 567

SOLOMON'S SONG.

v. 6 151
vi. 9 553
viii. 6 ..... 217, 553

ISAIAH.

i. 80, 411, 477
i. 1, 2 456
i. 1-10 411
i. 5 456
i. 7 411
i. 10, sq 408, 411
i. 11, sq 452
i. 15 ..... 320, 408
i. 18 ..... 317, 320
i. 21 ..... 320, 456
i. 23 289
ii. 491
ii. 1 ..... 476, 477
ii. 1-4 485
ii. 2 4 ..... 407, 517
ii. 3 489
ii. 5, sq 485, 510
ii. 5-8 405
ii. 11 499
ii. 12 ..... 405, 499
ii. 16 405
ii. 17 500
iii. 16, sq 556
iv. 2 527
v. 8, 9 ..... 235, 476
v. 14 170
v. 16 ..... 106, 499, 500
v. 18-23 405
vi 442, 466, 473
vi. 3 443
vi. 5 ..... 281, 457
vi. 6, 8 ..... 105, 444, 481
vi. 7 ..... 194, 445
vi. 9, sq 405, 493
vi. 10 165
vi. 12, sq 509
vi. 13 507
vii 408, 410
vii.–xii 489
vii. 3 509
vii. 9 459
vii. 14 527
viii 408
viii. 1, sq 407
viii. 11 ..... 466, 468, 474
viii. 12, 13 460
viii. 15 460
viii. 16 401
viii. 17, sq 450, 507
viii. 18 139
viii. 19 ..... 171, 172
ix. 1-5 487
ix. 2 490
ix. 2, 3 ..... 355, 490
ix. 4 530
ix. 5 527
ix. 6 ..... 490, 527
ix. 9 397
ix. 10 398
ix. 14, sq 408
x. 5, sq. 399, 496, 499, 501
x. 7 155
x. 7, 13 499
x. 16 439
x. 17 ..... 110, 114, 282
x. 18 151
x. 21 ..... 507, 509, 527
x. 24, 27 408
x. 26 355
xi. 1, sq 527, 530
xi. 4, 9 531

ISAIAH. PAGES
xi. 6 8 ..... 157, 510
xi. 10, sq 519
xi. 13 509
xii 3 352
x ii. 3, sq 496
xiii. 6 91
xiii. 9, sq 500, 502
xiii. 13 502
xiii. 21 451
xiv. 1, sq 519
xiv. 3 424
xiv. 9, sq 171
xiv. 10 171
xiv. 11 170
xiv. 13 499
xiv. 14 ..... 89, 172
xiv. 15 ..... 170, 173
xiv. 18 170
xv. 1 ..... 396, 407, 498
xv. 6 59
xvi. 9-11 475
xvi. 12 498
xvi. 14 488
xviii 409
xviii. 4 123
xviii. 7 412
xix 496, 520
xix. 1 104
xix. 14 449
xix. 19 520
xix. 23 496
xx. 1 409
xx. 2 ... 139, 392, 474, 477
xx. 5 ..... 400, 635
xx. 15 411
xxi. 1-10 475
xxi. 3 477
xxi. 6-8 476
xxi. 8 480
xxi. 10, 11 476
xxi. 16 488
xxii. 1-14 409
xxii. 9-11 411
xxii. 14 476
xxii. 21 213
xxiii. 15-17 ..... 498, 488
xxiii. 18 517
xxiv.–xxvii. 498, 502
xxiv. 5 498
xxiv. 21 447
xxiv. 22 515
xxiv. 23 ..... 440, 517
xxv. 6, sq 531, 561
xxv. 8 513
xxv. 9 460
xxvi. 4 ..... 95, 513
xxvi. 8, sq .. 127, 155, 515
xxvi. 9 151
xxvi. 14 171
xxvi. 18, 19 ..... 513, 515
xxvi. 21 ..... 238, 513, 515
xxvii. 1, 13 502
xxvii. 8 506
xxvii. 9 278
xxviii. 3 398
xxviii. 7 408
xxviii. 16 ... 460, 461
xxviii. 22 476
xxviii. 23–29 ..... 114, 197
xxviii. 24, sq 506, 508
xxviii. 29 527
xxix. 1 415
xxix. 4 171
xxix. 13 408
xxix. 10 476
xxix. 16 558
xxix, 18 457
xxix. 20, sq 408
xxx. 1, 9 456
xxx. 4 409
xxx. 8 407

ISAIAH. PAGES
xxx. 10 ..... 475, 477
xxx. 15, sq 408, 460
xxx. 20 457
xxx. 22 411
xxx. 27 126
xxx. 29 ..... 346, 377, 415
xxxi. 3 112
xxxi 4 442
xxxi. 5 346
xxxi. 9 282
xxxii. 3 457
xxxiii. 7 ..... 29, 409
xxxiii. 14 282
xxxiii. 22 ..... 199, 217
xxxiii. 24 511
xxxiv 502
xxxiv. 4 440
xxxiv. 5 267
xxxiv. 14 451
xxxiv. 16 407
xxxv. 4, sq 521
xxxvi.–xxxix 410
xxxvi. 1 411
xxxvi. 7 ..... 409, 411
xxxvi 10 97
xxxvi. 18-20 498
xxxvii. 3 411
xxxvii. 4, 17 101
xxxvii. 8, sq 411
xxxvii. 28 496
xxxvii. 30 343
xxxvii. 36 ..... 412, 451
xxxviii 412
xxxviii. 11 ..... 170, 538
xxxviii. 18 172
xxxix 410
xxxix. 6 500
xl. 424, 428, 489, 534
xl.–xlviii 453
xl.–lxvi. 120, 167, 424, 489, 532
xl. 6, 7, sq 460, 505
xl. 10, sq 521
xl. 13 112
xl. 15-17 498
xl. 17, sq 498
xl. 21 ..... 199, 538
xl. 25 ..... 106, 111, 459
xl. 26 ..... 15, 440
xl. 28 ..... 512, 538
xli 496
xli. 4 95
xli. 6, sq 498
xli. 8, sq ... 61, 507, 517
xli. 21 487
xli. 22 19
xli. 29 ..... 105, 533
xlii. 1 533
xlii. 4 517
xlii. 5 ..... 119, 120, 150
xlii. 6 ..... 517, 532
xlii. 18-25 ..... 505, 517
xliii. 1 178
xliii. 3, sq 497
xliii. 4, 7 ..... 126, 135
xliii. 9 19
xliii. 9-13 487
xliii. 10 ..... 104, 112
xliii. 15 ..... 178, 199
xliii. 24 ..... 14, 457, 458
xliii. 27. 160, 166, 457, 532
xliii. 28 375
xliv. 1, sq 517
xliv. 5 518
xliv. 6 ... 95, 100, 104, 199
xliv. 7 19
xliv. 9, sq 105, 498
xliv. 15 534
xliv. 18 165
xliv. 19 153
xliv. 22, 25 ..... 460, 487

ISAIAH. PAGES
xliv. 28 ..... 421, 426
xlv. 5, 18 104
xlv. 7 ..... 123, 124
xlv. 9 499
xlv. 9-11 558
xlv. 11 ..... 107, 178
xlv. 12 440
xlv. 14 518
xlv. 15 15
xlv. 16 248
xlv. 21, 22 ..... 487, 496
xlvi. 1 105
xlvi. 5 498
xlvi. 6 ..... 424, 499
xlviii. 4 59
xlviii. 8–11 ..... 457, 505
xlviii. 12 100
xlviii. 16 533
xlix. 6 517
xlix. 7 ..... 107, 113
xlix. 8 532
xlix. 14, sq 505
xlix. 22 519
xlix. 23 321
l. 1 ..... 241, 423, 505
l. 4 ..... 464, 476, 533
l. 10 ..... 460, 461
l. 11 424
li. 5, 6 ..... 440, 517
li. 13, 23 424
li. 15 443
li. 17 449
lii. 6 16
lii. 8 ..... 428, 476
lii. 12 521
liii 493, 532
liii. 1 532
liii. 4 534
liii. 6 532
liii. 7 273
liii. 8–10 ..... 533, 534
liii. 12 ..... 152, 534
liv. 5 ..... 88, 444
liv. 6 507
liv. 7–10 505
liv. 8, sq 507
liv. 9 56
liv. 13 508
liv. 17 507
lv. 3 ..... 175, 373, 534
lv. 6 480
lv. 8 482
lv. 11 467
lvi. 2 335
lvi. 3 ..... 517, 518
lvi. 7 ..... 453, 518, 519
lvi. 10 533
lvii. 1, sq 513
lvii. 3, sq 424
lvii. 15 ..... 107, 109, 138
lvii. 20 160
lviii 454
lviii. 3 452
lviii. 7 474
lviii. 13, sq . 334, 335, 453
lix. 12, 16 532
lix. 21 507
lx 517
lx. 7 453
lx. 9–11 517
lx. 21 507
lxi. 1 394
lxi. 8 175
lxi. 10 ..... 153, 154
lxii. 2, 11, 15 94
lxiii. 1–6 502
lxiii. 10 ..... 110, 142, 167
lxiii. 11 .. 71, 141, 180, 508
lxiii. 15 441
lxiii. 16 ..... 178, 181
lxiii. 17 ..... 165, 166

ISAIAH. PAGES

lxiv. 4.....165, 166
lxiv. 6.....457
lxiv. 7.....178, 180
lxv. 1.....16
lxv. 3.....423
lxv. 4.....454
lxv. 8, sq.....507, 517
lxv. 17.....15
lxv. 19.....511
lxv. 25.....157, 510
lxvi. 1.....137
lxvi. 1-3.....453, 519
lxvi. 16, 17.....454, 515
lxvi. 18-21.....519
lxvi. 20.....453
lxvi. 22.....15
lxvi. 23.....324, 519
lxvi. 24.....169, 515

JEREMIAH.

i. 2.....393, 415, 473
i. 4, sq.....466
i. 6.....473
i. 7.....394
i. 9.....466
i. 10, 11, 13.....467, 478
i. 18.....416
i. 19.....474
ii. 1.....456
ii. 2.....456, 458
ii. 8.....413, 435
ii. 26, 30.....413
iii. 1.....231, 456, 506
iii. 5.....456
iii. 14.....459
iii. 16, sq.....138, 435, 521
iii. 16.....257
iii. 17.....153
iii. 19, 20.....83, 180, 414
iv. 2.....62, 248
iv. 3.....492
iv. 4.....194
iv. 19.....154, 155
iv. 27.....416
v. 8, sq.....343
v. 14.....252
v. 20.....452
v. 22.....119
v. 31.....415
vi. 13.....415
vi. 17.....366, 476
vi. 20.....452, 454
vi. 27.....366
vii. 1-15.....415
vii. 4, sq.....415, 500
vii. 12.....252, 356
vii. 13.....413
vii. 21, 22.....289, 452, 454
vii. 25.....363
vii. 30.....413
viii. 2.....413
viii. 3, 8.....413, 435
viii. 9.....383
viii. 10, 11.....415
ix. 24, sq.....192, 194
x.....16
x. 3, sq.....105
x. 6.....126
x. 8.....498
x. 12.....543
x. 16.....443
x. 24.....114, 506
x. 25.....497
xi. 1-8.....415
xi. 20.....155
xi. 21.....416
xii. 1.....563
xii. 15-18.....557
xiii. 4, 7.....480
xiii. 16, 18.....402, 460
xiv. 9.....126

JEREMIAH. PAGES

xiv. 12.....452
xv. 1.....492, 532
xv. 4, 9.....152, 413
xv. 16.....466, 475
xv. 20.....474
xvi. 1.....507
xvii. 5.....459
xvii. 9.....154
xvii. 16.....466, 467, 475
xvii. 21, sq.....335
xvii. 26.....289, 452
xviii. 1-10.....492
xviii. 7.....492, 494, 498
xviii. 18.....212, 383, 415
xviii. 23.....278
xx. 7.....394, 466
xx. 9.....156
xx. 11.....474
xxi. 9.....463
xxi. 26.....480
xxii. 10-12.....417
xxii. 13-19.....417
xxii. 24-30.....418
xxiii.....466, 527
xxiii. 3.....507
xxiii. 6.....527
xxiii. 9.....119
xxiii. 11.....415
xxiii. 16.....464, 478
xxiii. 18.....15, 466, 482
xxiii. 25.....478
xxiii. 28.....143, 467, 478
xxiii. 30, sq.....464
xxiii. 33.....477
xxiii. 35.....479
xxiii. 36.....101
xxiv.....418
xxiv. 7.....457
xxiv. 16, 24.....421
xxv.....418, 488
xxv. 3.....415
xxv. 29.....501
xxvi.....417
xxvi. 3.....492
xxvi. 7, sq.....416
xxvi. 18.....408, 492
xxvi. 19.....493
xxvii.-xxix.....419
xxvii. 1.....420
xxvii. 3, 5.....419, 496
xxviii.....420, 466
xxviii. 1.....420
xxix. sq.....420
xxix. 1.....426
xxix. 2, 3.....402, 419
xxix. 5-7.....422
xxix. 13, 18.....457, 460
xxix. 24-32.....466, 473
xxx. 2.....407
xxx. 9.....457, 527
xxx. 10, 11.....506, 517
xxx. 20, 21.....457, 528
xxx.-xxxiii.....420
xxxi. 2.....505
xxxi. 9.....178, 460, 507
xxxi. 14.....452
xxxi. 19, 22.....139, 507
xxxi. 26.....478
xxxi. 29.....163, 563
xxxi. 31, 33.....154, 457, 508
xxxi. 34.....363, 365, 508
xxxi. 35.....507, 544
xxxi. 38, sq.....510
xxxii. 3.....457
xxxii. 16.....479
xxxii. 18, 20.....135
xxxii. 40.....175
xxxiii. 10, sq.....421
xxxiii. 11.....377, 452
xxxiii. 14-26.....527
xxxiii. 15, 16.....527

JEREMIAH. PAGES

xxxiii. 18.....452
xxxiii. 20.....62, 176
xxxiii. 25.....119
xxxiii. 35.....544
xxxiv. 1-7.....419
xxxiv. 8.....241
xxxiv. 8-10.....343
xxxiv. 13.....47
xxxiv. 18.....175
xxxv. 6.....393
xxxv. 8.....297
xxxv. 11.....418
xxxvi. 2, 3.....407, 492
xxxvi. 9.....327, 418
xxxvi. 10.....379
xxxvii.....419
xxxviii.....420
xxxviii. 17-20.....150
xxxix. 1-7.....420
xxxix. 8 sq.....420
xxxix. 10.....421
xxxix. 11-14.....421
xxxix. 18.....508
xl-xliv.....421
xl. 1-6.....421
xl. 7, sq.....421
xli. 1, sq.....421, 423
xli. 5.....399, 422
xlii. 4.....479
xlii. 7.....480
xliii. 8-14.....421
xliv. 17, sq.....421
xliv. 30.....421
xlv. 5.....463
xlvi. 1-12.....417
xlvi. 2.....419
xlvi. 10, sq.....267
xlvi. 10-26.....418
xlvi. 27, sq.....517
xlvii. 6, sq.....417, 418
xlviii.....516
xlviii. 42.....518
xlviii. 47.....489, 518
xlix. 6, 7.....502, 516
l. sq.....419, 502
l. 5.....507
li. 11, sq.....496
li. 15.....543
li. 30.....422
li. 39, 57.....515
li. 59.....419
lii. 4, 6, 12.....423
lii. 28, 29.....421

LAMENTATIONS.

ii. 6.....500
ii. 9.....363, 466, 485
ii. 14.....477
ii. 20.....420
iii. 20-24.....155
iii. 27.....555
iii. 33.....155
iii. 37, sq.....123
iii. 39.....163, 556, 558
iv. 7.....296
iv. 9, sq.....420
iv. 19, 21.....420
v. 7.....163
v. 9.....420

EZEKIEL.

i.....260, 393
i. 1.....343, 406, 466
i. 2, 3.....426, 466, 475
i. 26, 28.....146, 473
ii. 1, 2.....146, 473
ii. 8.....466
ii. 10.....475
iii. 1, 3.....466, 475
iii. 11.....406
iii. 14.....466, 475

EZEKIEL. PAGES

iii. 17.....366, 394
iv. 13, 14.....423, 453
v. 5.....83, 497, 521
v. 8.....500
vii. 12.....343
vii. 26.....212, 466
viii. 1-3.....479
viii. 14, sq.....413
viii. 15-17.....413
viii. 16-18.....377
ix.....500
ix. 4.....513
x. 1.....259
x. 2, 6, 7.....314
x. 5.....91
xi. 1.....479
xi. 5.....482
xi. 19.....458
xi. 21.....154
xi. 25.....423
xii.....488
xii. 13.....420, 421
xiii. 2, sq.....464
xiii. 5.....532
xiii. 9.....420
xiv. 1.....423
xiv. 1-20.....485
xiv. 3, sq.....423
xiv. 14, sq.....532
xiv. 14-20.....507
xvi.....456, 458
xvi. 5.....70
xvi. 8.....73
xvi. 60.....507
xvi. 63.....507
xvii.....419, 525
xvii. 2.....541
xvii. 15, 16.....250, 420
xvii. 22, sq.....530
xviii.....163, 453, 515, 563
xviii. 2, sq.....383
xviii. 4.....150, 151
xviii. 30-32.....402
xx. 1.....423, 453
xx. 1-4.....485
xx. 6.....83
xx. 7.....68
xx. 12.....328, 334, 335, 453
xx. 14, 22.....127
xx. 16.....154
xx. 26.....267, 268
xxi.....419
xxi. 3, 8.....513
xxi. 26.....479
xxi. 27.....523
xxii. 26.....106, 415, 454
xxiii. 8.....68
xxiv. 16.....213
xxiv. 17.....238
xxiv. 18.....480
xxiv. 19.....423
xxvi. 20.....170, 172
xxviii. 8, 10.....534
xxviii. 14.....260
xxx. 4, sq.....496
xxxi 9.....496
xxxi. 14.....170
xxxii. 18.....170
xxxii. 22.....170, 171
xxxii. 23.....172, 173
xxxiii. 2.....476
xxxiii. 7.....366
xxxiii. 11.....492
xxxiii 17.....163
xxxiii. 31.....154
xxxiv.....521, 527
xxxiv. 11, sq.....521
xxxiv. 24.....175, 521, 527
xxxiv. 25, sq.....175, 510
xxxv.....502
xxxv. 10.....422

EZEKIEL. PAGES
xxxv. 15 420
xxxvi. 5 420
xxxvi. 20, 21 .... 106, 505
xxxvi. 25–27 .... 453, 458, 508
xxxvii 513
xxxvii. 4, 11 514
xxxvii. 15, 22 509
xxxvii. 21 515
xxxvii. 23–27 458
xxxviii 428
xxxviii. 2 ..... 153, 428
xxxviii. 12 ..... 83, 502
xxxviii. 16 ..... 489, 502
xxxviii. 21 502
xxxviii. 24 527
xxxix. 7 106
xxxix. 29 507
xl.–xlii 378
xl.–xlviii 453
xl. 45, 46 ..... 205, 430
xl. 47 379
xli. 18 239
xliii. 2, 7 ..... 521, 524
xliii. 15, sq 282
xliii. 19 ..... 205, 430
xliv. 6, 7 ..... 194, 205, 272
xliv. 9 ..... 154, 429
xliv. 15 415
xliv. 23, 24 209
xliv. 23 454
xliv. 28 214
xlv 324
xlv. 18–20 319
xlv. 21 326
xlvi. 3, 9, 11 ..... 324, 327
xlvi. 17 339
xlvii. 6, sq 510
xlviii. 1–7 200
xlviii. 11 ..... 429, 430
xlviii. 23–28 200

DANIEL.
i. 1 418
i. 8, sq 453
ii 496, 503
ii. 21 496
ii. 27–34 443
iv. 17 443
iv. 27 454
v 470
v. 21 443
vi. 17 454
vii 482, 496, 503
vii. 1 478
vii. 8–11 503
vii. 10 444
vii. 13, sq 446, 529
vii. 14 490
vii. 18–23 ..... 89, 529
vii. 20, 25 503
vii. 22, 26 503
vii. 27 ..... 520, 529
viii. 9 83
viii. 11 285
viii. 15–17 ..... 446, 528
viii. 15 477
viii. 16 446
viii. 18 479
viii. 26 434
viii. 27 475
ix 488
ix. 4, sq 454, 457, 479
ix. 18 ..... 457, 459
ix. 21 ..... 286, 446
ix. 24 535
ix. 25 522
x 446
x. 1 466
x. 4 475
x. 5 ..... 314, 446, 528

DANIEL. PAGES
x. 8–10 474
x. 9 479
x. 13, 14 ..... 446, 488
x. 16, 18 446
x. 20, sq 446
x. 21 446
xi. 6 503
xi. 16 83
xi. 33, 35 514
xii. 1 ..... 446, 503, 514
xii. 2, 3 514
xii. 4 434
xii. 6 ..... 314, 528
xii. 7 446
xii. 10, 13 ..... 503, 514

HOSEA.
i 479
i. 4 395
ii 456
ii. 1 ..... 135, 180
ii. 2 ..... 500, 509
ii. 8, sq 196
ii. 10 359
ii. 13 ..... 331, 388
ii. 16 73
ii. 17, 18 ..... 82, 510
ii. 19 507
ii. 20 176
ii. 23 510
iii 425
iii. 2 323
iii. 4 500
iii. 5 ..... 509, 526
iv 396
iv. 6–8 ..... 388, 389
iv. 15 388
v. 7 388
v. 13, sq 397
vi. 2 512
vi. 6 452
vi. 7 160
vi. 9 388
vii 396
vii. 8–16 397
viii. 9, sq 397
ix. 1 ..... 325, 326
ix. 3 298
ix. 4 ..... 423, 500
ix. 5 388
ix. 7, sq 397, 423, 473
ix. 15 ..... 196, 388
x. 4 397
xi. 1 ..... 181, 456
xi. 8 506
xi. 8, 9 115
xi. 9 ..... 109, 111, 113
xi. 10, sq 507
xii. 1 ..... 88, 514
xii. 2 397
xii. 4, 5 ..... 65, 130
xii. 6, sq 95, 96
xii. 9 ..... 160, 161
xii. 10, sq 364
xii. 12 388
xii. 13 514
xii. 14 79
xiii. 5 177
xiii. 14 512
xiv. 2 ..... 287, 460

JOEL.
i. 14 352
i. 15 ..... 91, 499
ii. 1 499
ii. 12, sq 293, 492
ii. 18 115
ii. 28, sq 468, 508
iii. 1 ..... 365, 428, 490, 496, 501
iii. 3, 4 ..... 404, 500

JOEL. PAGES
iii. 3, 6 ..... 244, 494
iii. 14 504
iii. 15 440
iii. 16 ..... 407, 502, 504
iii. 17, 18 510
iii. 19 497
iii. 20 509

AMOS.
i. sq 396, 476, 496
i. 1 476
i. 2 407
i. 3, sq 395, 397
i. 6 404
i. 9 497
i. 11 404
ii. 6 241
ii. 11, sq 296, 364
iii. 2 ..... 177, 500
iii. 6, 7 ..... 17, 18, 363, 466, 476, 482
iii. 8 ..... 466, 467
iii. 14 256
iv. 4, 5 ..... 298, 388, 389
iv. 6–11 500
iv. 12 485
v. 5 ..... 388, 396, 405
v. 8 ..... 440, 501
v. 10 395
v. 14, 18 ..... 396, 500
v. 21, sq. 388, 452
v. 22 288
v. 26 ..... 68, 69
vi. 1–6 395
vi. 8 102
vi. 14 ..... 396, 496
vii 476, 477
vii. 1, 2, sq 478, 492, 500, 532
vii. 1–6 507
vii. 8 493
vii. 12 393
vii. 13 387
vii. 14 464
vii. 15 ..... 393, 466
viii. 5 335
viii. 5–10 388
viii. 6 241
viii. 12 ..... 363, 466
viii. 14 ..... 396, 405
ix. 1 380
ix. 5 437
ix. 7 ..... 496, 499
ix. 8 ..... 397, 500, 508
ix. 9 507
ix. 11 ..... 500, 516, 526
ix. 12, 13 ..... 127, 510
ix. 15 509

OBADIAH.
verse 3 59
" 10–14 421
" 15, sq 501
" 17, sq 509
" 20 244
" 21 517

JONAH.
iii. 3–10 492
iv. 3, 11 ..... 113, 150

MICAH.
i. 2, sq 442, 501
i. 13 ..... 405, 408
ii. 2 ..... 189, 344
ii. 11 ..... 408, 467
ii. 12 507
iii 408
iii. 5, 8, sq 108, 467
iii. 7 479
iv. 1 486

MICAH. PAGES
iv. 1–3 518
iv. 1–4 ..... 407, 517
iv. 4 378
iv. 5 126
iv. 9, sq 526
iv. 10 500
iv. 11 428
iv. 12 ..... 501, 504
v. 1 ..... 85, 226
v. 2, sq 526, 530
v. 3 ..... 127, 526
v. 3–10 490
v. 4 529
v. 4–10 510
v. 6, sq 507, 530
vi 456
vi. 6 ..... 408, 452, 454
vi. 7 ..... 268, 303, 308
vi. 16 408
vii. 3 289
vii. 4 366
vii. 9 456
vii. 14 ..... 83, 510
vii. 16 518
vii. 17 321
vii. 18, sq 462, 506
vii. 19 ..... 278, 453

HABAKKUK.
i 465, 479, 499, 557
i. 1 476
i. 6, sq 496, 499
i. 11 ..... 55, 460, 499
i. 12, 13 111
i. 16 499
ii 465, 502
ii. 1 ..... 476, 479
ii. 2 ..... 407, 513
ii. 3 ..... 460, 488
ii. 4 ..... 460, 507
ii. 5 170
ii. 6 511
ii. 13, sq 482
ii. 14 502
ii. 20 442
iii 465
iii. 11 440
iii. 19 474

ZEPHANIAH.
i. sq 500
i. 5 410
i. 7 499
i. 15, sq 503
ii. 3 499
iii. 4 413
iii. 9 ..... 127, 516
iii. 10 518
iii. 12 507

HAGGAI.
i 427
ii. 3 ..... 427, 428
ii. 5 ..... 141, 427
ii. 6–21 427
ii. 7, sq 427, 517
ii. 11, sq 209, 435
ii. 21 502
ii. 23 426

ZECHARIAH.
i 474
i.–vi 478
i. 8, sq 445
i. 12 ..... 131, 445, 450
i. 14 115
ii 493
ii. 1–4 427
ii. 9 521
ii. 11 493
ii. 13 442

ZECHARIAH. PAGES
ii. 17 441
iii. 445, 449, 534
iii. 3 ..... 314, 451
iii. 7 442
iii. 9 317
iv. 1 ..... 478, 480
iv. 1-6 427
iv. 4 477
iv 7-9 427
iv. 10 441
v. 1-11 427
vi. 9-15 535
vi. 12 527
vi. 13 ..... 216, 535
vi. 15 ..... 493, 494
vii. 3 428
vii. 3-5 423
vii. 12 ..... 466, 467
vii. 14 422
viii. 2 115

ZECHARIAH. PAGES
viii. 10, sq 378
viii. 19 423
viii. 20-23 427
ix. 6 517
ix. 7 516
ix. 9, sq 530
ix. 10 510
ix. 11 ..... 264, 530
x. 2 478
x. 12 126
xi. 4-14 535
xi. 8 396
xi. 10 176
xii.-xiv 503, 504
xii. 1 119
xii. 8 528
xii. 10, sq 460, 528, 535
xii. 11 413
xiii. 1 458

ZECHARIAH. PAGES
xiii. 2 438
xiii. 4 392
xiii. 7 ..... 528, 535
xiv 503
xiv. 5 ..... 103, 105, 442
xiv. 9 ..... 127, 517
xiv. 16 ..... 516, 517
xiv. 16-19 519
xiv. 18 351
xiv. 20, sq 510, 511

MALACHI.
i. 2 497
i. 4 497
i. 6 ..... 432, 434, 453
i. 7 272
i. 11 ..... 127, 519
i. 13 269

MALACHI. PAGES
ii. 4 205
ii. 5, sq 212
ii. 7 ..... 435, 528
ii. 9 ..... 434, 453
ii. 10-16 231
ii. 14 ..... 227, 534
ii. 17 ..... 432, 528
iii. 1, sq 432, 528
iii. 2 528
iii. 2, 18 503
iii. 3, sq 453
iii. 5 528
iii. 6 ..... 95, 96, 505
iii. 7 432
iii. 7-12 453
iii. 13, sq. 432
iii. 19 282
iii. 19-23 432
iv. 1-5 432
iv. 5 ..... 499, 528, 529

NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW. PAGES
iii. 4 392
iii. 17 129
v. 21 189
xi. 8 392
xi. 11 ..... 433, 463
xi. 13 ..... 10, 11
xv. 5 294
xvii. 3 80
xvii. 5 129
xix. 6 148
xix. 7 231
xix. 8 199
xix. 18, 19 ..... 188, 190
xxi. 43 494
xxii. 24, 25 235
xxii. 30 147
xxii. 32 173
xxiv. 14 504
xxiv. 29 489
xxvi. 63 249

MARK.
vii. 11 ..... 262, 294
ix. 49 ..... 271, 282
x. 19 ..... 186, 189

LUKE.
i. 15 ..... 294, 297
i. 59 194
ii. 21 194
iv. 21 343
ix. 30 80
ix. 32 480
ix. 55 559
xvi. 29 173
xx. 28 235
xx. 36 147
xxiv. 44 10

JOHN.
i. 14 138
i. 17 19
i. 18 15
iii. 1 141
iii. 14 78
iii. 27 480
iii. 30 433
iv. 12 399
vi. 45 ..... 363, 508
vii. 37 352
viii. 12 352
viii. 44 159

JOHN. PAGES
viii. 58 96
xi. 51 ..... 467, 479
xii. 28 129
xiv. 23 138
xvii. 2 508

ACTS.
i. 7 488
iii. 1 286
iii. 24 362
vii. 5 61
vii. 22, 23 70
vii. 25 71
viii. 37 154
xii. 17 132
xvii. 26 57
xxvi. 7 202
xxvii. 9 310

ROMANS.
ii. 7, 10 454
ii. 25 499
iii. 2 431
iii. 10 430
iii. 25 28
iv. 18 61
vii. 7 ..... 189, 455
viii 463
viii. 21 342
ix. 3 74
ix. 8 61
x. 4 19
x. 9 154
xi. 5 432
xi. 25-36 ..... 198, 494
xiii. 9 186
xvi. 20 159
xvi. 25 19

1 CORINTHIANS.
i. 18-30 19
v. 7 348
vii. 10 472
viii. 4 105
x. 1, 2 75
x. 4 134
x. 17 349
x. 19 105
xi. 3-16 297
xi. 8 147
xiii. 9 491
xiii. 12 ..... 143, 144

1 CORINTHIANS. PAGES
xiv. 24 367
xiv. 32 469
xv. 28 15
xv. 55 513

2 CORINTHIANS.
i. 20 491
iii. 3 508
v. 21 308
vii. 3 247
xii. 2-4 479

GALATIANS.
iii 61
iii. 24 19
iv. 2 26
iv. 9 19

EPHESIANS.
i. 9 19
ii. 12 ..... 18, 19, 483
ii. 15 6
vi. 2 190

COLOSSIANS.
ii. 14 6
ii. 17 19

PHILIPPIANS.
i. 7 217

1 TIMOTHY.
ii. 13 147

HEBREWS.
i. 1 491
iii. 7 75
iv. 9 ..... 332, 343
vi. 17 171
vii 61
viii. 5 254
viii. 13 569
ix. 6 317
ix. 7 ..... 314, 315
ix. 8 ..... 255, 256
ix. 14 280
ix. 15 28
ix. 19 280
x. 1 19
xi 460
xi. 4, 7 ..... 54, 55

HEBREWS. PAGES
xi. 8-19 61
xi. 37 392
xi. 40 ..... 80, 463, 565
xii. 18 75

JAMES.
ii. 23 61
v. 4 439

1 JOHN.
ii. 20, 27 508
iii. 12, 15 159

1 PETER.
i. 10 ..... 19, 42, 483
i. 11 489
ii. 9 179
iii. 20 55
iv. 17 500

2 PETER.
i. 20 42
ii. 4 448

JUDE.
verse 6 448
verse 9 447

REVELATION.
i 257
i 1 488
i. 4 93
i. 6 179
i. 13 530
i. 13-15 446
i. 17 474
iv. 6 259
iv. 8 ..... 93, 260, 444
v. 8 256
vii. 4 202
vii. 15 138
viii. 3 256
x. 9 475
xi. 17 93
xii. 7 447
xii. 9 159
xii. 10 450
xvi. 5 93
xix. 14 442
xx. 8 502
xxi. 1, 3 ..... 15, 493
xxii. 6-12 132

ERRATA.

Page	11,	line	18	from the	top,	for	כתובים,	read כְּתוּבִים.
"	12,	"	26	"	bottom,	"	Luthard,	" Luthardt.
"	40,	"	22	"	"	"	Baudissen,	" Baudissin.
"	59,	"	14	"	"	"	point,	" points.
"	59,	"	6	"	top,	"	Chaldaer,	" Chaldäer.
"	66,	"	19	"	bottom,	"	Eber's,	" Ebers'.
"	82,	"	7	"	top,	"	there,	" then.
"	88,	"	8	"	"	"	are,	" is.
"	89,	"	4	"	bottom,	"	God,	" gods.
"	110,	"	20	"	"	"	others,	" elsewhere.
"	111,	"	13	"	"	"	הָמוּנַת,	" תָּמוּנַת.
"	114,	"	13	"	top,	"	הַי,	" חַי.
"	130,	"	6	"	bottom,	"	angel,	" angels.
"	131,	"	19	"	"	"	that,	" than.
"	158,	"	10	"	top,		*dele* comma after "*by*."	
"	160,	"	25	"	"	"	חָטָאת.	read חַטָּאת.
"	160,	"	28	"	"	"	עָוֹן,	" עָוֹן.
"	162,	"	4	"	"	"	רָק,	" רַק.
"	166,	"	3	"	"	"	הַטָּאת,	" חַטָּאת.
"	167,	"	5	"	bottom,		*dele* comma after "Moses."	
"	183,	"	12	"	"	"	*The whole*,	read *All the.*
"	206,	"	18	"	"	"	in future,	" in the future.
"	248,	"	1	"	"	"	חְי,	" חַי.
"	251,	"	6	"	top,		*dele* "up."	
"	263,	"	20	"	bottom,	"	כָּפֶר,	" כְּפֶר.
"	267,	"	28	"	"	"	sacredly.	" sacred.
"	279,	"	10	"	"	"	point,	" points.
"	285,	"	22	"	"	"	נִ׳חֹחַ,	" נִ׳חֹחַ.
"	286,	"	17	"	"	"	צָהֳרַיִם.	" צָהֳרַיִם.
"	287,	"	1	"	"	"	זָבְחִים,	" זְבָחִים.
"	288,	"	27	"	"	"	נְרָבוֹת,	" נְדָבוֹת.
"	302,	"	5	"	"	"	illustrations,	" lustrations.
"	305,	"	22	"	"	"	any participation,	" to partake.
"	314,	"	17	"	top,	"	made,	" made by.
"	324,	"	17	"	bottom,	"	*Handbuch*,	" *Handwörterbuch.*
"	325,	"	8	"	"	"	*alteren*,	" *älteren.*
"	373,	"	23	"	"	"	that,	" than.
"	376,	"	16	"	top,	"	whom,	" which.
"	381,	"	1	"	bottom,	"	countenance,	" continuance.
"	463,	"	2	"	top,	"	were,	" was.

E. H. MILLER
1326-4TH ST. S. E.
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.
BINDING

Denver Seminary Library
Washington DC Extension
1st Bapt Church Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414